

THE SCOTTISH UNION
AND NATIONAL INSURANCE COMPANY.
(ESTABLISHED BY ACT OF PARLIAMENT.)
CAPITAL £6,000,000.
In which is incorporated THE LANCASHIRE AND YORKSHIRE INSURANCE
COMPANY, LIMITED.
30, BROWN STREET, MANCHESTER.

This COMPANY'S GUARANTEE BONDS are accepted by
H.M. COURTS OF CHANCERY and BOARD OF TRADE, and by
all Departments of H.M. Government.

The "RED CROSS" POLICY of the Company provides against
ALL ACCIDENTS and ALL ILLNESSES.

Policies are also issued indemnifying Employers in relation to the Workmen's Compensation Acts, 1897, 1900, and 1906, the Employers' Liability Act, 1880, and at Common Law, and Public Liability (Third Party) Risks.

R. KENNEDY MITCHELL,
Manager Accident Department.

FIRST AVENUE HOTEL,

High Holborn, W.C. LONDON.

Very Convenient for Solicitors and Clients visiting London. Opposite Chancery-lane, and a few doors from "Tube" Station. A most comfortable First-class Hotel for Families and Gentlemen. Quiet bedrooms with private bath-rooms adjoining, overlooking Gray's-inn Gardens. Moderate tariff; no charge for attendance. Free Garage on Hotel premises. Telegrams: "Firavtel, London."

GORDON HOTELS, LIMITED.

LEGAL AND GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.

ESTABLISHED 1836.

FUNDS	- - -	£5,500,000
INCOME	- - -	£722,000
YEARLY BUSINESS	- - -	£2,790,000
BUSINESS IN FORCE	- - -	£21,000,000

THE PERFECTED SYSTEM of Life Assurance is peculiar to this Society and embraces every modern advantage.

PERFECTED MAXIMUM POLICIES.

WITHOUT PROFITS.

The Rates for these Whole Life Policies are very moderate.

Age	Premium	Age	Premium	Age	Premium
20	£1 7 8 ½	30	£1 16 7 ½	40	£2 10 7 ½

£1,000 POLICY WITH BONUSES

According to last results.

Valuation at 2½ p.c. —Hm. Table of Mortality.

Duration	10 yrs.	20 yrs.	30 yrs.	40 yrs.
Amount of Policy	£1,199	£1,438	£1,724	£2,067

Full information on application to
THE MANAGER, 10, FLEET STREET, LONDON.

The Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter.

LONDON, APRIL 13, 1907.

The Editor cannot undertake to return rejected contributions, and copies should be kept of all articles sent by writers who are not on the regular staff of the JOURNAL.

All letters intended for publication must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

Notice.

A Digest of all the Cases reported in the "Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter" during the legal year 1906-1907, containing references to the Law Reports, will be issued weekly, as a Supplement, during the months of August and September.

Contents.

CURRENT TOPICS	379	BONIFACI	388
SECURITIES HELD BY UNREGISTERED MONEY-LENDERS	382	LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL	389
THE GOVERNMENT BILL TO AMEND THE LAW RELATING TO PAYMENTS AND DESIRES	384	OBITUARY	390
THE LATE MR. WILLIAM WILLIAMS	384	LEGAL NEWS	391
REVIEWS	385	WINDING-UP NOTICES	391
CORRESPONDENCE	385	COURT PAPERS	391
POINTS TO BE NOTED	386	CREDITORS' NOTICES	391
		BANKRUPTCY NOTICES	391

Cases Reported this Week.

"Commonwealth," The.....	386
"Hopper No. 66," The.....	386
North Staffordshire Colliery Owners' Association v. North Staffordshire Railway Co. and Others.....	386
Wakefield and District Light Railway Co. v. Mayor, &c., of Wakefield	387
Weinberg, Re. Ex parte The Official Receiver	388

Current Topics.

The Easter Cause Lists.

THE AGGREGATE number of appeals—namely, 358—is a slight increase on that at the commencement of the last sittings, when there were 345 appeals. There were 324 appeals a year ago. The exertions of the judges of the Chancery Division have reduced the Chancery list from 310 to 249 matters. There were only 171 a year ago. The King's Bench lists also shew some diminution. There were 997 causes at the commencement of the last sittings, while there are 893 now. But a year ago there were only 774 causes.

The Private Bills of 1907.

IT SEEMS tolerably certain that there will not be the usual amount of business in the committee rooms during the present session. The six classes of private Bills before the present Parliament which deal with railways, canals, tramways, and the supply of gas, water, and electricity number 101, or exactly 50 less than last session, and the total amount of money which it is proposed to raise is 42 millions odd, or about 15½ millions less than before. There are three tube, or partially tube, Bills before Parliament, but the mileage is of an insignificant amount, and, as a matter of fact, no Bills dealing with tube railways have been allowed to proceed since 1901, upon the ground, first, that a Royal Commission has been appointed to consider the whole subject of our metropolitan traffic; and, secondly, because the establishment of the proposed Traffic Board has not yet been completed. The railway Bills are of no particular interest, and there is a material deficiency in the usual number of tramway and gas Bills. Water Bills, however, form an exception to the decline in quantity and quality of other measures brought forward in the present session. They number twenty-five, against seventeen, and include the Birkenhead Corporation Water Bill, which takes power to raise a loan of £1,750,000 to be expended in obtaining a supply of water from rivers in the county of Denbigh and in the acquisition of additional lands and

the construction of new works. Bills of an important nature are also promoted by the Metropolitan Water Board. The Bills for the supply of electricity are likewise of an ambitious character.

Unpronounceable Names.

THOSE who read, or attempt to read, the reports of Indian cases before the Privy Council must often be sorely perplexed with regard to the proper pronunciation of the names of the parties and of other persons referred to in the reports. This difficulty does not press upon the counsel engaged in these cases, for they have often practised in India and have some sort of acquaintance with the language and nomenclature of that vast dependency. This was not the case with the late Lord SELBORNE, who, while at the bar, had a large practice in these appeals, but we have been told that he exhibited the same confidence in repeating the names of Hindoos as in dealing with other matters in his instructions. The judges of the Supreme Court of the United States appear to shew less fortitude in similar difficulties. In an appeal from the Supreme Court of Hawaii in the Sandwich Islands, the appellants were described as DAVID JONAH KAWANANAKOA, ABIGAIL KAWANANAKOA, and ELIZABETH KAWANANAKOA. The judge who presided, Mr. Justice HASLAM, had, according to custom, to announce the title of the case, but instead of doing so he smiled and confessed that he was unable to pronounce the names of the plaintiffs in error. The counsel for the appellants did not appear, and when the counsel for the respondents was asked to give the proper pronunciation, he respectfully declined, saying that the names in question did not belong to his clients. It may be added that names which are wholly unfamiliar to legal practitioners are not merely hard to pronounce, but are hard to remember, and add to the labour of mastering a case. Notwithstanding this, we believe that a learned judge once ascribed his success in life, among other things, to an unpronounceable name.

The Prevention of Corruption Act, 1906.

BEFORE THE Prevention of Corruption Act, 1906, was passed, we were constantly hearing of the pressing need of some such measure; and the wide prevalence of the evil which the Act is intended to cure was strenuously insisted upon. It came into operation, however, over three months ago, and only quite lately, for the first time, has any case been reported of proceedings under it. The Act provides that if any agent corruptly accepts from any person any gift or consideration as an inducement or reward for doing or forbearing to do any act in relation to his principal's affairs or business, he shall be guilty of a misdemeanour. And the person who gives the gift or consideration to the agent is equally guilty. In the recent case, apparently, the accused had given money to the man in charge of a railway van to convey some goods from one place to another, without the knowledge of the railway company and contrary to his duty to them. The van man was, no doubt rightly, held to be an agent of the railway company, and the accused was convicted and fined. The case, however, is a paltry one, and is probably not an example of a class of offence which is very common. The question then at once suggests itself, why is this insignificant case the only fruit of the first three months' life of the Act? The answer, no doubt, lies in the fact that no prosecution for an offence under the Act can be instituted without the consent of the Attorney-General or the Solicitor-General. This proviso will probably be found to have a paralyzing effect upon the operation of the Act; and it is hard to see why it exists for England and Ireland, whereas no similar restriction is provided in the case of Scotland. Of course, in a really serious case, where a large sum has corruptly changed hands, the necessity of obtaining the consent of the Attorney-General will not prove an obstacle to proceedings; and it is quite possible that the eminent gentleman has now before him a batch of cases in which his consent is requested. But to bring about a better state of things, and to bring home to the public mind the fact that giving and accepting "commissions" are offences, it is necessary to strike at the multitudinous cases of a small class. It is well known that butchers often give cooks presents to induce the latter to buy more meat for their employers than otherwise would be bought. This may serve as a type of the corruption

which should be shewn up and weeded out. We venture to say that a butcher once convicted of this offence would be very careful of his future conduct. If it was merely a matter of taking out a summons against the butcher, probably we should have had by now a good many cases reported under the Act. But very few persons will go to the trouble and expense of laying a case of this sort before the Attorney-General. Therefore such things will probably go gaily on, and the Act will have few terrors for the man who bribes in small sums.

The Companies Bill.

A VERY strong letter appeared in the *Times* of the 8th inst. from Mr. A. MOSELEY, calling for the strengthening of the Companies Bill in certain directions and the omission of some of the relaxations of existing practice which it proposes. Mr. MOSELEY emphasizes the fact that the Bill is required for the purpose of placing a check upon dishonest company promotion, and he suggests that the members of the Board of Trade Committee, upon whose report the Bill is founded, never got to close quarters with the real evils to be dealt with. Their weakness, he says, lay in the fact of "their being unused to, or even completely unaware of, the systems of trickery and dishonesty carried out by some of the sharpest and most unscrupulous brains in the City of London," and this Mr. MOSELEY regards as forming a danger to the efficiency of the Bill. With his desire to check dishonest promotion there will be universal agreement, and, if evidence of particular cases of such promotion can be given before a Parliamentary Committee, it will be easier to shape the Bill so as to meet it. So far, however, the Bill appears to be founded upon the idea that it was extremely improper of company promoters to arrange to avoid the numerous requirements of section 10 of the Companies Act, 1900, by dispensing with a prospectus, without evidence that anyone is entitled to complain of having been hurt by this course. It is proposed to substitute the filing of a corresponding statement at Somerset House, notwithstanding the extremely lukewarm support given to the proposal by the committee. It does not seem to occur to anyone responsible for legislative proposals that the remedy lies entirely with investors themselves, and that no one is bound to purchase shares in a company which has commenced business without filing a prospectus. Mr. MOSELEY urges that the Bill should be strengthened by organizing a department of the Board of Trade whose special business it should be to listen to the complaints of aggrieved shareholders, and, upon a *prima facie* case being made out, to overhaul all the affairs of the company complained about. It is needless to say that the creation of such a department would be officialism of a particularly objectionable type. Investors can make their own inquiries before they embark their money, and afterwards, if there is anything radically wrong, they have the courts open to them. But the business world could not put up with the establishment of the Board of Trade as a permanent committee of investigation. There is more substance in Mr. MOSELEY's objection to the removal of the present prohibition upon the issue of shares at a discount. The proposal to do this is merely made as the logical outcome of the permission to pay out of the company's capital for underwriting. But we are not sure that underwriting new issues is such an unmixed boon as to form the basis for so fundamental a change in the law.

Mr. Justice Grantham on the Court of Appeal.

A PLAN, at once simple and radical, for dealing with the Court of Appeal has been propounded by Mr. Justice GRANTHAM in a letter to the *Times* of the 8th inst. The learned judge's ideas go back to the time when, we gather, he was vainly contending for the retention of common law courts and common law doctrines against the combined Liberal and Conservative forces of Lord SELBORNE and Lord CAIRNS—Chancery lawyers both of them, who were only better than their predecessor Lord WESTBURY in that they did not—to quote Mr. Justice GRANTHAM—speak of common law with contempt, although they "more or less despised it, and especially that palladium of British liberty, its trial by jury." It is, perhaps, a little late in the day to grumble, as the learned judge does, at the prevalence of equity, and it may be doubted whether

it has in fact been carried so far as the authors of the Judicature Acts intended. Moreover, it is hardly practicable to return to the system of separate Courts of Appeal for the common law and Chancery sides. Mr. Justice GRANTHAM still looks to the Court of Exchequer Chamber with regret, and he would reconstitute it by a Court of Appeal for the King's Bench Division constituted of a permanent head and of ordinary judges selected from the division. But we already have the best that can be done in this way when there is a good Divisional Court of three sitting with the Lord Chief Justice as president. It will hardly be thought that this represents all that a Court of Appeal should be. On the Chancery side it is proposed that the arrangement should be similar—a permanent head assisted by ordinary judges of the division. We doubt whether the judges of the division, however competent to sit in judgment on each other, would favour the notion. They may respectfully decline to follow each other other's judgments while sitting at first instance, but to overrule them is another matter. Nor has it been an unmixed evil to have common law judges called to adjudicate upon equity matters, and *vice versa*. Neither rules of equity nor of law should be so technical as to be unintelligible except to specialists, and the present composition of the Court of Appeal tends to avoid this. We fear that the learned judge's letter, however interesting, does not offer a practical solution of the question of the existing arrears in the Court of Appeal.

Debenture-holders and Winding-up Orders.

THE TENDENCY appears to be now strongly in favour of making a winding-up order whenever the circumstances of a company are unsatisfactory, notwithstanding that debenture-holders are in possession by a receiver of the whole of the assets, and that apparently there will be nothing for unsecured creditors. This tendency has been represented recently by the decisions of WARRINGTON, J., in *Re Chic* (1905, 2 Ch. 345), of BUCKLEY, J., in *Re Alfred Melson & Co.* (1906, 1 Ch. 841), and of the Court of Appeal in *Re Crigglestone Coal Co.* (1906, 2 Ch. 327), and it has now received further illustration in the decision of PARKER, J., in *Re Hermann Lichtenstein & Co.* (*Times*, 27th ult.). In *Re Chic* the debenture-holders were carrying on the business for their own benefit in the name of the company, and WARRINGTON, J., made the order for the purpose of putting an end to this state of things. In *Re Alfred Melson & Co.* BUCKLEY, J., referred to the modern growth of the system of covering all the assets by debentures, and held that the mere fact of the debenture-holders being entitled to sweep away everything did not deprive the court of its power to order a winding up. And in *Re Crigglestone Coal Co.* the Court of Appeal held that it was sufficient ground for a winding-up order that the unsecured creditors would obtain independent representation in the debenture-holders' action, and might thereby obtain some benefit. In the present case of *Re Hermann Lichtenstein & Co.* there was the difference that a voluntary winding up was already in progress. It was, in consequence, objected that for a creditor to obtain a compulsory winding up he must shew that he would be prejudiced by the voluntary winding up, since section 145 of the Companies Act, 1862, provides that a voluntary winding up shall not be a bar to the right of any creditor to a compulsory winding up "if the court is of opinion that the rights of such creditor will be prejudiced by a voluntary winding up." But although the section seems to make proof of prejudice to the petitioning creditor from the voluntary winding up a condition of his obtaining a compulsory order, yet it was held in *Re E. Bishop & Sons* (1900, 2 Ch. 254) that this is not so, and that section 145 does not interfere with sections 91 and 149, under which, in all matters relating to winding up, the court is to have regard to the wishes of creditors. Hence it may override a voluntary winding up by a compulsory order when the wishes of the creditors are expressed in favour of this course, although the petitioning creditor does not shew particular prejudice to himself. This being so, the existence of a voluntary liquidation in the present case, and the failure of the petitioning creditor to prove prejudice, did not exclude the jurisdiction of the court, and, a substantial number of creditors supporting the petition, and a case for inquiry into the affairs of the company having been made out, the winding-up order was made, notwithstanding that the debenture-holders had appointed a receiver.

Medical Referees under the Workmen's Compensation Act.

THE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT, 1906, by section 10, enacts that the Secretary of State may appoint such legally qualified medical practitioners to be medical referees for the purposes of the Act as he may, with the sanction of the Treasury, determine, and the remuneration of, and other expenses incurred by, medical referees under the Act shall, subject to regulations made by the Treasury, be paid out of moneys provided by Parliament. It is unnecessary to mention that the whole Act has been the subject of active discussion in the daily and weekly press ever since it received the Royal Assent, and the *Lancet*, in dealing with the appointment of the medical referees, observes that they will be called upon to decide between the conflicting views of medical practitioners; to give opinions in obscure and difficult surgical cases; and their decisions are to be final; they are therefore to act as judges from whose decisions there is no appeal. "In these circumstances it is perfectly clear that the practitioners selected for these posts must be of sufficient recognized standing to possess the confidence of their medical *confrères* in the several districts. Medical men will willingly meet in consultation, and place their considered opinions before a medical referee for final judgment and award, where the medical referee enjoys a high professional position and reputation, but these qualifications are necessary if the decisions of the referee are to be accepted as satisfactory solutions of points in dispute." It is to be hoped that the appointment of the referees will give satisfaction to the medical profession, so that the new procedure may work smoothly and without friction. A judge of county courts has, under the second Schedule to the Act, power to summon a medical referee to sit with him as assessor, and any committee, arbitrator, or judge may, subject to regulations made by the Secretary of State and the Treasury, submit to a medical referee for report any matter which seems material to any question arising in the arbitration. The effect of these provisions should make the adjustment of the compensation payable to a claimant a matter of little difficulty, though it may make some slight addition to the expenses of the State.

Petitions for the Commutation of a Sentence of Death.

HALF A MILLION of signatures are stated to have been affixed to a petition praying for the revision of the sentence of death on the convict RAYNER, who was found guilty of murder without any recommendation to mercy on the part of the jury. We have no desire on the present occasion to bestow any criticism upon the action of the Home Secretary in granting a reprieve, but we have some difficulty in thinking that this petition ought to have weighed with him in arriving at his decision. The right of petitioning the Crown for redress of grievances is supposed to be a fundamental principle of the constitution, but the ordinary petition for the pardon of, or a mitigation of the sentence upon, a criminal is open to serious objection. The reasons which induce many persons, especially those of the poorer classes, to sign a petition of this description may easily be conjectured. The convict was a good-looking young man in desperately needy circumstances, and the murdered man a brusque and strenuous shopkeeper, who from small beginnings had acquired enormous wealth, and had summarily rejected an application by his murderer for assistance. We cannot see any reason in these circumstances why clemency should be extended to the prisoner, but we have little doubt that a large number of the unthinking members of the community would take a different view. To these must be added the large number of persons who object to capital punishment and who would readily sign a petition to save from execution any prisoner who had been sentenced to death. In the Northern States of America, when a jury is empanelled to try a crime punishable with death, they are asked individually whether or not they are opposed to the punishment of death. Anyone who answers this question in the affirmative is immediately dismissed from the jury-box. It may reasonably be suggested that those who sign a petition in favour of a person sentenced to death should be required to state whether they are opposed to capital punishment. But whatever may be the

opinion of an ordinary citizen on this question, ought he in reason to have any *locus standi* in asking a criminal court to revise its sentence? Most persons would be astonished if an unsuccessful litigant were to present a petition, with a number of signatures, praying the High Court to set aside the judgment against him and to enter it in his favour. Is the opinion of the judge who presided at the trial of a murderer to be treated with less consideration?

The Law Relating to Whales.

THE CASE of *Cleethorpes Urban Council v. Foster Brothers*, in which an application was recently made to PARKER, J., for an injunction to restrain the defendants from exhibiting the body of a whale which they had towed into the Humber and left high and dry on the beach, may serve to remind us that references to this huge fish are more often found in the older law reports than in those of the present day. The statute of EDWARD II., c. 11, enacts in general terms that the king shall have (as part of his prerogative) whales and great sturgeons taken in the sea or elsewhere within the realm. This royal franchise is, of course, limited to whales taken within the seas which are part of the realm, or cast on shore, and the king's right appears to have been only asserted in respect of whales of considerable size. With regard to the smaller whales cast on shore, the rule, in Scotland at any rate, was that they belonged to the catcher, without regard to the rights of landlord or tenant. As to the capture of whales on the high seas, there are cases in the English reports as to the custom of the northern whale fishery and the rule with regard to the property in whales harpooned and captured, called the law of "fast and loose," by which the person who first harpoons a fish, and retains his hold of that fish until it is finally captured, is to be regarded as the proprietor of the fish, although the actual capture and killing of the whale may be accomplished by the assistance of other persons. This rule involves the condition that if the fish, after it has been harpooned, breaks away from the person who first harpoons it, or if the fish is subsequently abandoned, that fish, though dying in consequence of the wound originally inflicted by the harpoon, is a "loose" fish and becomes the property of the person who first finds it and takes possession of it. But the use of gas and other modern illuminants has seriously diminished the profits of whale fishing, and it is to be feared that the customs relating to it will gradually cease to possess any legal interest.

Sewers and Income Tax.

IT HAS now been decided by the Court of Appeal, apparently for the first time, that sewers which are liable to be rated to poor rate are also liable to be charged with income tax, as being hereditaments capable of actual occupation and so chargeable in respect of the annual value according to Schedule A, rule No. 1 of the Income Tax Act, 1842: *Ystradyfodog, &c., Sewerage Board v. Beneted* (1907, 1 K. B. 490). Sewers which are wholly underground are, by an anomalous exception resting on decided cases, exempt from assessment to poor rate (*London County Council v. Erith Churchwardens*, 1893, A. C. 562), but it must now be taken that, in all cases which cannot be brought strictly within these anomalous decisions, sewers are hereditaments taxable under the Land Tax Act and Income Tax Acts. The same principle, in fact, governs the liability of sewers in this respect as applies to tunnels of a railway (see *Metropolitan Railway v. Fowler*, 1893, A. C. 416), and these "horizontal" hereditaments represent true property of the soil, and not mere easements over or through it. The same principle should also apply to water mains and gas mains, and it seems probable that decisions which lay down that the occupation of the soil by means of water pipes, &c., is not an occupation amounting to property in the space occupied by the pipes will eventually be held to be wrong in principle: see, for instance, *Chelsea Waterworks v. Bowley* (1851, 17 Q. B. 358), where a water company were held not liable to be assessed to land tax.

A New Building Court.

THE LANDOWNERS and builders of London are interested in property of great value, and the controversies under the London Building Acts are numerous and important, but we must

confess that the proposal, which has been recently made, that there should be a Building Court, presided over by a judge with a salary equal to that of a judge of the High Court, and assisted by a registrar, appears to us unreasonable and extravagant. It appears to be forgotten that under the Act of 1894 there is already a tribunal of appeal, consisting of an architect, a surveyor, and a barrister, and unless it can be shewn that this tribunal is wholly inefficient in the discharge of its duties, there can be little hope that the Legislature will be induced to incur the expense of a new and special court for building cases. The fact that representations have been made to the Government in favour of an increase in the existing staff of judges of the superior courts can hardly be regarded as favourable to the prospects of the Building Court. We must, at the same time, express our strong concurrence with a recommendation made by one of those who have written in the daily papers upon the present state of the building law in London—namely, that it should be amended by allowing questions of light and air to be referred to the tribunal of appeal, and that the powers of this tribunal should be enlarged so as to enable it to deal finally with all the questions which ordinarily arise in such cases.

Criminal Proceedings Against Corporations.

PROCEEDINGS which have been recently taken in the United States against the New York Central Railway Co., owing to the terrible accident by which the Brewster express was wrecked, twenty-four persons killed, and sixty-seven injured, illustrate the tendency of modern statutes to make corporations liable, criminally as well as civilly, in cases where the penalty for the offence is not imprisonment or corporal punishment. After the State Railroad Commission and the coroner had completed their investigation of the wreck, the grand jury returned an indictment, not only against certain officials of the railway, but also against the corporation itself, which is liable under the Criminal Code, if negligence is proved, to a fine not exceeding 5,000 dollars. It is well settled in this country that a corporation may be indicted by their corporate name for breaches of public duty, whether in the nature of misfeasance or nonfeasance, but we cannot remember any case in which an indictment has been preferred against a railway company for breach of their duties as carriers of passengers, resulting in injury or death.

Securities Held by Unregistered Money-lenders.

In the case of *Lodge v. National Union Investment Co.* (1907, 1 Ch. 300) PARKER, J., has delivered a very interesting judgment upon the position of an unregistered money-lender with regard to securities which he holds for a loan. According to *Victorian Daylesford Syndicate v. Dott* (54 W. R. 231; 1905, 2 Ch. 624) a money-lender who enters into a contract of loan without being registered under the Money-lenders Act, 1900, is unable to enforce it. "Every time," said BUCKLEY, J., in that case, "the money-lender contracts otherwise than in his registered name he is doing an illegal act," with the result, as the learned judge held, that he could not sue upon the contract. And this was approved by the Court of Appeal in *Bonnard v. Dott* (1906, 1 Ch. 740). "It seems to me," said COLLINS, M.R., "that the sub-section [i.e. section 2, sub-section 1] means this, that any person who is in fact a money-lender must comply with the terms of the Act as to registration in order to take advantage of any contract." The learned judge also suggested that the borrower could call for a return of his securities. "The consequence," he said, "is that whether it is the borrower or the lender who brings the matter before the court, the transaction is absolutely void. The lender cannot compel the borrower to return the money lent, while the borrower, being one of the class which the Act was presumably designed to protect—see *Kearley v. Thomas* (24 Q. B. D. 742)—can compel the lender to return the securities for the loan, at any rate on the terms of repaying the amount lent." This point, which was not necessary for the decision in *Bonnard*

v. Dott, has now been the subject of discussion in *Lodge v. National Union Investment Co.* (*suprd*).

In the latter case the plaintiff, Lodge, was contingently entitled in reversion expectant on the death of his mother to certain stocks and securities. In March, 1905, he mortgaged his reversion to GREENE to secure £750 and interest, the security also including a policy for £800 on his life. In November, 1905, he obtained a further £1,250 from the defendant company on an assignment of his reversion subject to GREENE's mortgage—the assignment being in form absolute, but in fact by way of mortgage—and he also assigned to them a policy on his own life for £3,000. At the same time he accepted two bills at three months drawn upon him by the company for £1,000 and £250 respectively. The company retained certain sums for interest and commission and paid over the remainder—£1,075—to the plaintiff's solicitors, who duly accounted for it to the plaintiff. In February, 1906, when the bills fell due, they were renewed for three months on payment of a sum of £150. The defendant company also paid off GREENE and took a transfer of his mortgage and of the policy for £800. In May, 1906, the plaintiff commenced his action against the company, grounding it upon the fact of their not being registered as money-lenders under the Act of 1900, and he claimed, *inter alia*: (1) a declaration that the contracts and transactions were illegal and void; (2) delivery up to him of the assignments, bills, and securities; and (3) repayment of the £150 paid for renewing the bills.

For the company it was argued that the plaintiff could obtain the return of his securities only upon the terms of repaying the money lent, and in the absence of any decision to this effect on the Act of 1900, reliance was placed upon the decisions on the Usury Acts. So far as the plaintiff's claim was equitable, PARKER, J., admitted the relevance of these decisions, and also that they required that he could not enforce his claim unless he was prepared to repay the money lent. "It seems," said the learned judge, "reasonably clear that, at any rate in equity, if not also at law, a person taking advantage of the exception arising from the fact that he belonged to the class for whose protection the statutes were passed could not assert any right unless he was himself prepared to do what the court considered fair to the defendant"; and he referred to *Mason v. Gardiner* (4 Bro. C. C. 436), where Lord LOUGHBOROUGH, C., allowed a demurrer to a bill asking for delivery up of an usurious security, the bill containing no offer to make payment.

The principle that where a statute affecting contracts with illegality is passed for the protection of a special class of persons, an exception is made in their favour when it is necessary to set up such a contract in legal proceedings was referred to in *Kearley v. Thomson* (*suprd*). *Prima facie*, since the contract is illegal, neither party can found any rights upon it. "Whoever," said WILMOT, L.C.J., in *Collins v. Blantern* (1 S.M. L. C. (7th ed.), p. 369), "is a party to an unlawful contract, if he hath once paid the money stipulated to be paid in pursuance thereof, he shall not have the help of the court to fetch it back again." But in *Kearley v. Thomson* it was pointed out that there are various exceptions to this rule, one being where a statute has been intended to protect a certain class of persons, and the person seeking to recover is a member of the protected class. "Instances of that description," said FAY, L.J., "are familiar in the case of contracts void for usury under the old statutes, and other instances are to be found in the books under other statutes, which are, I believe, now repealed, such as those directed against lottery keepers." In such case the member of the protected class could recover from the other, notwithstanding that both had been parties to an illegal contract.

At common law it was similarly held in *Fitzroy v. Gwillim* (1 T. R. 153) that relief would be given from an usurious contract, but only upon the terms of the borrower paying principal and lawful interest. The action being in trover for the return of goods pawned under an illegal contract, Lord MANSFIELD described it as an equitable action brought by the plaintiff in order to be relieved from an usurious contract. He must therefore, he said, come with clean hands according to the principle that those who seek equity must do equity. "A lender upon an usurious contract is precluded from recovering

anything upon such contract; but if the borrower seek relief he must first do what is right as between the parties. Here the plaintiff did not tender what had been actually advanced, and cannot therefore have the benefit of this equitable action."

But this attempt of Lord MANSFIELD's to introduce equitable considerations was looked on with suspicion by later judges, who were more disposed to adhere to the strict common law, and the borrower was treated with more favour, and was allowed to recover goods pawned under an usurious contract without payment. In *Hargreaves v. Hutchinson* (2 A. & E. 12) PATTESON, J., questioned whether the court had any discretion, the contract being altogether void, and the King's Bench upheld a verdict in trover for the value of the goods pawned. In *Tregen v. Attenborough* (7 Bing. 97) TINDAL, C.J., said that *Fitzroy v. Gwillim* (*suprd*) had been looked on with suspicion for many years, if not actually overruled; and he suggested that it had been really decided upon the footing of the action being for money had and received. "It was treated," he said, "by Lord MANSFIELD as if it had been an action for money had and received; for he began by saying, 'This is an equitable action.' But trover is an action of strict law."

In the present case PARKER, J., suggested that the real reason of these later decisions was that the plaintiff in an action of trover really relies upon his property in, or a superior right to possession of, the goods he seeks to recover; and in order to shew that right it is not necessary for him in any way to mention the illegal contract. But if this was in fact the ground of the decisions it is singular that no notice was taken of the judgment of BULLER, J., in *Fitzroy v. Gwillim*, where it is shewn that it is the borrower who must first set up the usurious contract: "The borrower brings the action. It is enough for the defendant to say that the goods were pawned by the plaintiff. Then the plaintiff in answer is obliged to shew an agreement, by which she is entitled to have these goods returned to her on payment of certain interest, which is usurious on the face of it, and which she is desirous of setting aside." This being so, it could only be set aside upon equitable terms.

PARKER, J., referred to further cases in which the question was discussed in the common law courts, and also to a certain divergence in practice between the King's Bench and the Common Pleas, the latter court being readier than the former to introduce equitable considerations: *Hindle v. O'Brien* (1 Taunt. 413), *Roberts v. Goff* (4 B. & Al. 92). But in the result he found it unnecessary to decide the controversy, as in the case before him the plaintiff's claim was not framed with reference to any right in trover or detinue, but with reference to the relief to which he would be entitled in equity. It was, therefore, an equitable claim, and, according to *Mason v. Gardiner* (*suprd*), it could only succeed upon the terms of the plaintiff doing equity and repaying the £1,075 which he had received. Even if the claim had been in trover, yet since the assignments to the company were in form absolute, the illegal contract must have been set up by the plaintiff and the same result would follow.

There remained the point as to the £150 which had been paid by the plaintiff for the renewal of the bills, and as to which his claim was in effect an action for money had and received. But this action, as observed by Lord MANSFIELD in *Moses v. Macferlan* (2 Burr. p. 1012), is a kind of equitable action, and lies for money which "*ex aequo et bono* the defendant ought to refund." One example he quotes is, where, in obtaining the payment of money, an undue advantage has been taken of the plaintiff's situation, contrary to laws made for the protection of persons under those circumstances. Mr. Justice PARKER treated the plaintiff in the present case as being in this position in regard to the £150, so as to be entitled to have it returned. Consequently he directed that the securities (except GREENE's mortgage) should be returned by the defendant company upon the plaintiff repaying the £1,075, less the sum of £150 and certain smaller sums which the company were willing to give up. If in any future case it is necessary to recur to the above conflict between equity and strict law in the common law courts in Lord MANSFIELD's time, it is not improbable that equitable considerations will prevail. If the money-lender is forced to give up his securities, he is at least entitled to repayment of his actual advance.

The Government Bill to Amend the Law Relating to Patents and Designs.

II.

THE Bill proposes to strike at the practice of taking out a Patent for a chemical invention which the Patentee has not reduced to practical working. It is alleged that such Patents are often taken out for some collateral purpose. The Bill proposes to provide that a Provisional Specification and a Complete Specification must, "if required" in the case of an application for Patent for a chemical invention, be accompanied by such specimens or samples as may be prescribed. In some kinds of chemical inventions it may be extremely difficult, and in others practically impossible, to manufacture samples at the date when the Patent is applied for. Consequently, a liberal interpretation will have to be given to "if required," and we think that the requirement should only be operative in the case of a Complete Specification.

A provision in the Bill which will cause a good deal of alteration in prevailing practices is that of clause 30, which is to be substituted for section 106 of the Patents, &c., Act, 1883, and which provides that the grant of a Patent under this Act (*i.e.*, the Act of 1883) shall not be deemed to authorize the Patentee to use the Royal Arms, or to place the Royal Arms on any patented article, and imposes a fine on any unauthorized use of such Arms.

Another provision of the Bill which will cause some fluttering in the dovecots is a provision imposing a fine on any person who uses on his place of business, or on any document issued by him, or otherwise, the words "Patent Office," or any other words suggesting that his place of business is officially connected with, or is, the "Patent Office." Under this, not only would a patent agent be prohibited from using the words "Patent Office," and also apparently the words "Office for Patents," but not, of course, "Office for obtaining Patents."

We have referred to some of the most interesting and important provisions of the Bill so far as it relates to Patents. We will now refer to the important provisions of Part II., which relate to Designs. It is proposed by clause 19 (1) that on an application before the expiration of the original period of copyright in a Design, the Comptroller shall, on payment of a prescribed fee, extend the period of copyright for a further period of five years from the expiration of the original five years. This sub-clause, although probably right in principle, is defective in its terms. In the first place, it does not say by whom the application can be made; secondly, it does not give any grounds on which the application is to be based; and, thirdly, it says the Comptroller *shall*, whereas obviously it should be the Comptroller *may* extend, &c. There is to be no appeal from the Comptroller in the matter, which is probably right, and the Comptroller is given no power to award costs to an opponent of extension, which is certainly wrong.

With regard to the marking of articles to which a Design has been applied, it is proposed by the Bill to repeal so much of section 51 of the Act of 1883 as provides that the copyright in a Design is to cease if the proprietor fails to comply with the requirements of the section as to marking, but it is proposed that, in the event of any failure to comply with such requirements, the proprietor of the Design shall not be entitled to recover any penalty or damages in respect of any infringement of his copyright in the Design, unless he shews that he took all proper steps to ensure the marking of the articles, or unless he shews that the infringement took place after the person guilty thereof knew, or had received notice of, the existence of copyright in the Design. Furthermore, the Bill provides that where a representation is made to the Board of Trade, by or on behalf of any trade or industry, that in the interests of the trade or industry it is expedient to dispense with or modify, as regards any class or description of articles, any of the requirements of section 51 as to marking, the Board may, if they think fit, by rule under the principal Act dispense with or modify such requirements as regards any such class or description of articles to such extent, and subject to such conditions, as they think fit.

By analogy with the provisions as to Patents, the Bill proposes to give to any person interested, after a Design has been on the Register for a year, the right to apply to the Comptroller for cancellation of the registration on the ground that the Design is used for manufacture exclusively or mainly outside the United Kingdom, and where such an application is made the provisions of the new Act with respect to the revocation of Patents worked outside the United Kingdom are to apply, with the necessary modifications, "except that there shall be no appeal from the decision of the Comptroller." Why there should be no appeal it is not easy to see.

The Bill also proposes to make section 31 of the Act of 1883, as to the granting of certificates of validity in actions for infringement which carry solicitor and client costs in subsequent actions, and section 32, as to actions for injunctions to restrain the continuance of groundless threats of legal proceedings, applicable *mutatis mutandis* to Designs. It also proposes to give power to the Comptroller, on request in writing, to cancel the registration of a Design, either wholly or in respect of particular goods.

In our remarks on clause 9 of the Bill (*ante*, p. 371) we omitted to point out that it does not provide that all proceedings for Revocation of Patents shall be commenced before the Comptroller, but only where the ground for Revocation is one of the grounds on which the grant of a Patent may be opposed. If Revocation is sought on any other ground (except the special ground of working outside the United Kingdom) the proceedings must be by Petition direct to the Court under section 26 of the Act of 1883—*i.e.*, unless clause 9 of the Bill is intended to give the defendant in an action for infringement the right to counterclaim for the Revocation of the Patent, which we think would be a right thing to do; but if it is intended to do it by clause 9, the language used does not seem to us sufficient to carry out the intention.

Before concluding our remarks on the Bill, we ought to draw attention to clause 13, which provides that Rules of the Supreme Court may be made for regulating the matters at present dealt with by sub-sections (5) (6) and (7) of section 26 and those contained in section 29 of the Patents, &c., Act, 1883, and that on the coming into operation of such Rules "the said enactments shall be repealed." Section 26 deals with Petitions for Revocation, and the sub-sections mentioned are those which provide for Particulars of Objections and the right to begin on the hearing of a Petition. Section 29 is the section which regulates the delivery of Particulars of Breaches and Particulars of Objections and the costs thereof. We have, on more than one occasion, pointed out the unfair way in which, under certain circumstances, the present procedure as to Particulars of Objections operates against a defendant, and we presume that when Rules of Court are made as provided for by clause 13 of the Bill, these hardships will be removed. It is obviously much better that this course should be adopted than that the alterations required should be incorporated in the Bill itself.

The late Mr. William Williams.

IN MR. WILLIAM WILLIAMS, who died at his residence, Parkside, Wimbledon, on Easter Monday, the 1st inst., the profession has lost one of its oldest and most respected members.

Mr. WILLIAMS was articled to the late Mr. WILLIAM MURRAY, of Birch-in-lane, in the year 1833, and was admitted a solicitor in the year 1839. He subsequently joined the firm of Currie & Woodgate, and on the death of Mr. CURRIE in 1860 (Mr. WOODGATE having previously retired from the firm and died) he continued to practise by himself until the year 1874, when he took his son, Mr. CHARLES BRIDGEWATER WILLIAMS, into partnership. Mr. WILLIAMS was at 32, Lincoln's-inn-fields for a great many years, until the house was pulled down for the purposes of the Land Registry, and he then migrated to 12, Lincoln's-inn-fields.

Mr. WILLIAMS was a member of the Council of the Incorporated Law Society for a great number of years, and was president in 1865-6. There was, unfortunately, then no annual provincial meeting of the society at which he could express his views on current legal topics, or we fancy they would have been found to be in advance of those of many of his colleagues. During his year of office as President important steps were taken by the society for promoting the concentration of the courts and offices, and efforts were made to improve the remuneration

of solicitors. In 1892 his portrait, painted by Mr. VAL PRINSEP, was presented to him by subscription amongst members of the Council, and it hangs in the reading-room of the Law Society. In August, 1900, he retired from the Council, and was presented by his colleagues with some very handsome pieces of plate as a token of their esteem and regard. Mr. WILLIAMS was also a member of the Law Reporting Council for many years.

No man who was ever placed upon the Council of the Law Society was more regular, or gave more time and attention to the various matters coming before the Council. In all matters of legislation affecting the law Mr. WILLIAMS was a most ready and admirable critic, and his great experience, more particularly with reference to real property law and the practice of conveyancing and equity, which for many years took up so much time at meetings of the Council, was of the greatest possible advantage to his colleagues and to everybody who had to deal with matters relating to those subjects.

Before the introduction of the Bills which ended in the erection of the courts upon what was called the Carey-street site, Mr. WILLIAMS took a very prominent part in the question of the site of the Courts. He was a member of the Courts of Justice Commission which was appointed on the passing of the Bills, and he was unremitting in his efforts to press upon the Government the necessity for carrying the scheme suggested by those Bills into effect. Mr. WILLIAMS also took a very prominent, and indeed the most prominent, part in conjunction with the late Baron POLLOCK and others, in carrying through the Act of Parliament which vested Wimbledon Common in conservators, of whom he was one of the first.

Mr. WILLIAMS was a director of the Legal and General Life Assurance Society, the Law Guarantee and Trust Society, and the Law Fire Insurance Society up to the time of his death. He was for many years chairman of the Legal and General Life Assurance Society, and he was also for some little time the chairman of the Law Guarantee and Trust Society.

Mr. WILLIAMS' knowledge of law and its principles was profound, and as a man of business he had few equals—the power he possessed of getting at once to the bottom of a matter being most striking. His wise counsel, ripe judgment, and great ability were ever at the service of any member of the profession who sought his aid, and there must be many living who can bear testimony to this kindly trait in his character.

Reviews.

The Customs Laws.

THE CUSTOM LAWS: INCLUDING THE CUSTOMS CONSOLIDATION ACT, 1876, WITH THE ENACTMENTS AMENDING AND EXTENDING THAT ACT, AND THE PRESENT CUSTOMS TARIFF FOR GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND; ALSO THE CUSTOMS LAWS AND TARIFF FOR THE ISLE OF MAN; WITH OTHER ENACTMENTS AFFECTING THE CUSTOMS, AND NOTES OF THE DECIDED CASES. By NATHANIEL J. HIGHMORE, Barrister-at-Law, Solicitor for his Majesty's Customs. SECOND EDITION. Published for H.M. Stationery Office by Stevens & Sons (Limited).

This is a useful collection of the statute law and the cases governing the payment of customs. The bulk of the statute law is now contained in the Customs Consolidation Act, 1876, and this with annotations forms the greater part of the work. The subsequent statutes which have amended or extended the Act are introduced in their appropriate places, so that the effect is to carry on the work of consolidation to the present time. The decisions upon smuggling, so far as they are still relevant, are collected in a note to section 186 of the Act. The above matters form Part II. of the work. Part I. sets forth in tabular form the present customs tariff for Great Britain and Ireland, the references to the various Acts of Parliament under which they are levied being given in foot-notes, and Part III. contains the Acts having special reference to particular goods. A number of subsidiary statutes, including certain sections of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, are collected in Part V.

International Law.

COMMERCE IN WAR. By L. A. AHERLEY-JONES, K.C., M.P., assisted by HUGH H. L. BELLOT, M.A., D.C.L., Barrister-at-Law. Methuen & Co.

The book contains a great mass of material on the subjects of contraband, blockade, carriage of property at sea, the right of search, and capture and condemnation, and the student will find it to be a mine of information upon these subjects. The various rules which have prevailed among different nations and at different times with regard to the capture of property at sea are well brought out in Chapter IV. The leading rule at the present day is that contained in the Declaration of Paris—the neutral flag covers

enemy's goods, except contraband of war; neutral goods, except contraband of war, are not liable to seizure under the enemy's flag—but the United States remained, and still remains, outside the Declaration, because it did not contain the suggested proviso, quoted at p. 317, protecting also private property of the belligerents other than contraband. This is a further amelioration of the conditions of naval warfare which is bound to come in time, notwithstanding the traditional opposition of this country. In Chapter V. the right of search is very fully explained, and reference is made at the outset to the judgment of Sir William Scott in *The Maria* (1 Rob., p. 359), in which the right of visiting and searching merchant ships upon the high seas was stated to be an incontestable right of the lawfully commissioned cruisers of a belligerent nation. Unfortunately there is no hint at present of the right being disputed, and at p. 304 it is pointed out that even the distance of the neutral vessel from the scene of hostilities is no ground for denying the right of belligerents to search it. But this also is a right which may not unreasonably be contested as arbitration gradually replaces war, and the true character of belligerency is recognized. The book is well supplied with quotations from leading English and American cases and from official instructions, and will prove very useful where questions on the rights and obligations of commerce in war have to be determined at a distance from a library.

Correspondence.

Sharing Commissions.

[To the Editor of the *Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter*.]

Sir,—I am likely to have a good deal of legal business in Ireland shortly, and in view of its being launched, in making the preparatory arrangements, I naturally desired that it should be dealt with on "agency terms."

Relying to my suggestion, the firm of solicitors to whom I intend to entrust the business write me as follows:

"We feel a difficulty in respect of this matter, having regard to the recently expressed view of your Law Society, and, indeed, the views that are now shared, we understand, by the Incorporated Law Society in this country—viz., having regard to the recent legislation as to the right of Irish solicitors to share their remuneration with their English professional brethren, or *vice versa*. We would be glad to have your views. We may mention that this difficulty has arisen with a great number of our profession, and we are all anxiously trying to find some legitimate solution of the question which has been raised."

In reply to this letter, I wrote suggesting that the subject might be ventilated, and a solution discovered, through the instrumentality of your excellent publication, and in reply the firm referred to write as follows: "We think your suggestion a good one, and we have no objection."

I therefore place the foregoing before you, so that the question may elicit an expression of opinion from you, and the numerous readers of the *SOLICITORS' JOURNAL*.

It occurs to me, that a solicitor in England, Ireland, or Scotland, or "the British dominions beyond the seas," might, *ipso facto*, be deemed to be a solicitor in that part of the kingdom in which he instructed another solicitor to act as his agent, or that there might be an amalgamation, or on payment of a small "prescribed" fee and the production of a certificate from one law society to the other, a solicitor in any part of the realm might be entitled to be enrolled as a solicitor in every or any other part of the king's domains. Under the Judicature Act an English (solicitor) commissioner can swear affidavits to be used in an Irish court. ROBERT SCOTT HOPPER.

Whitley Bay, Northumberland.

[We hope to refer to this subject hereafter.—ED. S.J.]

It is stated that Mr. Justice Pickford will go on the South Wales Circuit at the ensuing Summer Assizes in place of Mr. Justice Walton, and that the latter will go on the second part of the Western Circuit in succession to Mr. Justice Bigham, who will take the place of Lord Justice Kennedy on the second part of the South-Eastern Circuit.

The annual general meeting of the bar will be held in the old dining hall of Lincoln's-inn, on Tuesday, the 16th of April, 1907, at 4.15 o'clock. The annual election of members to fill the vacancies upon the council will be held in the week ending the 11th of May, 1907. Every barrister is entitled to vote at the election, and voting papers with instructions to voters will be sent to every barrister whose professional address within the United Kingdom is given in the Law List. Every candidate for election must be proposed in writing, and his proposal form signed by at least ten barristers, must be sent to the secretary at the offices of the council, at 2, Hare-court, Temple, on or before Tuesday, the 23rd of April, 1907. Proposal forms may be obtained from the secretary, 2, Hare-court, Temple.

Points to be Noted.

Conveyancing.

Will—Power to Retain Investments—Wasting and Hazardous Investments—Income.—When a testator authorizes the retention of his property in its existing state, but gives no direction as to the income arising till conversion, a distinction has been established between wasting and hazardous securities. Wasting securities must necessarily decline in value as time goes on, and, in accordance with the rule in *House v. Earl of Dartmouth* (7 Ves. 137), equality is produced as between tenant for life and remainderman by allowing the tenant for life to have only interest on the capital value. Thus the power to postpone conversion simply authorizes the trustees to retain the property unconverted; it does not alter the rights *inter se* of tenant for life and remainderman. But hazardous securities—that is, securities which are not proper as original investments under the will—stand upon a different footing. Their retention is not necessarily any prejudice to the remainderman, and the direction for their retention really adds them to the list of authorized investments. Consequently the actual income goes to the tenant for life. This is in accordance with *Re Sheldon* (North, J., 39 Ch. D. 50), though the distinction was not recognized in *Re Chaytor* (Warrington, J., 1905, 1 Ch. 233).—**RE BATES** (Kekewich, J., Oct. 31, 1906) (1907, 1 Ch. 22; *ante*, p. 27).

Will—Solicitor-trustee's Remuneration.—In settling a solicitor-trustee's remuneration clause for insertion in a will two distinct points have to be considered—the remuneration of the trustee for professional work done in connection with the testator's estate, and his remuneration for work which is not professional, and which, in general, a trustee who was not a solicitor would do personally. Where the clause is intended to cover remuneration for the latter class of work, it must be clearly worded so as to shew this intention, and there is no difficulty in giving it the required scope. The following words were held to have this effect in *Re Fish* (1893, 2 Ch. 413): "Including all business of whatever kind not strictly professional, but which might have been performed, or would necessarily have been performed, in person by a trustee not being a solicitor." But a clause directing the allowance to the solicitor-trustee of "all professional and other charges for his time and trouble" will not be thus extended, notwithstanding the reference to "other charges," and under a clause so drawn the solicitor-trustee cannot charge for work which is not professional work.—**RE CHALINDER & HETHERINGTON** (Warrington, J., Nov. 11, 1906) (1907, 1 Ch. 58; *ante*, p. 69).

CASES OF LAST Sittings.

Court of Appeal.

NORTH STAFFORDSHIRE COLLIERY OWNERS' ASSOCIATION v. NORTH STAFFORDSHIRE RAILWAY CO. AND OTHERS. No. 1. 26th March.

RAILWAY—RATES—INCREASE—INCREASE SINCE THE 31ST OF DECEMBER, 1892—COMPLAINT—JURISDICTION OF RAILWAY COMMISSION—RAILWAY AND CANAL TRAFFIC ACT, 1894 (57 & 58 VICT. c. 54), s. 1, SUB-SECTION 1.

By section 1, sub-section 1, of the Railway and Canal Traffic Act, 1894, "Where a railway company have, either alone or jointly with any other railway company or companies, since the last day of December, 1892, directly or indirectly increased, or hereafter increase, directly or indirectly, any rate or charge, then if any complaint is made that the rate or charge is unreasonable, it shall lie on the company to prove that the increase of the rate or charge is reasonable"

Held (by Cozens-Hardy, M.R., and Fletcher Moulton, L.J., dissenting), that the section was not limited to an increase of a rate or charge above that in existence on the 31st of December, 1892, but applied to an increase of any rate or charge.

Appeal from an order of the Railway and Canal Commission. The applicants were an association of traders who consigned coal from collieries in North Staffordshire over the railways of the defendant companies (the North Staffordshire, the London and North-Western, and the Great Western Railway Companies, and the Shropshire Union Railway and Canal Co.), and they had obtained a certificate from the Board of Trade authorizing them to make such complaints as the Railway and Canal Commission had jurisdiction to determine. The applicants complained that the defendants had increased as from the 1st of August, 1900, the rates set forth in the schedule to the application, and that the increased rates were unreasonable. They asked for an order enjoining the defendants from increasing the said rates in force on the 31st of July, 1900. The defendants alleged that the increased rates were reasonable, and were not greater than those which were in force on the 31st of December, 1892. In consequence of legislation passed in 1892, confirming various provisional orders, which came into operation on the 1st of January, 1893, a general rise in rates was made by the railway companies as from the last-mentioned date. The traders complained, and in consequence the Railway and Canal

Traffic Act, 1894, was passed, which, by section 1, sub-section 1, provided that "where a railway company have, either alone or jointly with any other railway company or companies, since the last day of December, 1892, directly or indirectly increased, or hereafter increase, directly or indirectly, any rate or charge, then if any complaint is made that the rate or charge is unreasonable, it shall lie on the company to prove that the increase of the rate or charge is reasonable, and for that purpose it shall not be sufficient to shew that the rate or charge is within any limit fixed by any Act of Parliament or by any provisional order confirmed by Act of Parliament." The applicants contended that the above section applied to the increase of any rate which a railway company might at any time have upon its books. The defendants contended that it only applied to an increase of a rate over the amount at which the rate stood on the 31st of December, 1892. Bigham, J., held that the defendants' contention was correct, and gave judgment for them. The other commissioners agreed. The order, as drawn up, declared that "section 1 of the Railway and Canal Traffic Act, 1894, does not apply to rates that are not greater than those that were in force between the same places on the last day of December, 1892." The applicants appealed.

The COURT (COZENS-HARDY, M.R., and FLETCHER MOULTON and KENNEDY, L.J.), having taken time to consider, delivered judgment allowing the appeal, KENNEDY, L.J., dissenting. The majority of the court held that the section applied to every increase of rates, and was not limited to an increase over the rates in existence on 31st of December, 1892.—COUNSEL, Balfour Browne, K.C., and R. Whitehead; Sir Robert Finlay, K.C., and Joseph Shaw; J. A. Simm; Urquhart, K.C., Ernest Moon, K.C., and Harold Russell, SOLICITORS, M. A. Orgill, for J. H. Knight, Newcastle-under-Lyme; Burchells; C. de J. Andrews; R. R. Nelson.

[Reported by W. F. BARRY, Barrister-at-Law.]

"THE HOPPER NO. 66." No. 1. 25th March.

SHIP—LIMITATION OF LIABILITY—"OWNER"—CHARTERER—MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894 (57 & 58 VICT. c. 60), ss. 503, 504.

The charterer by demise of a ship, who has the complete control of it during the period covered by the charter, but who is not the registered owner, is not the "owner" thereof so as to be entitled to limit his liability under sections 503 and 504 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, for damage from collision caused by the negligence of his servants.

Appeal from the judgment of Bargrave Deane, J.: reported in 1906, P. 34. By an agreement, dated the 9th of June, 1903, made between the London and Tilbury Lighterage Co. (Limited), who were the owners of the steam hopper No. 66 and Sir John Jackson (Limited), who were described therein as the charterers, the hopper was demised to the charterers for a minimum term of eighteen months, with power to the charterers to extend the hire by giving three months' notice before the end of the eighteen months, the owners to have the right of terminating the hire at the end of two years by giving the charterers three months' notice; and the charterers were to have the complete control and management of the hopper. During the currency of the charter the hopper, while proceeding to sea with a load of excavations, collided with the steamship *Blanche*, and in consequence thereof *The Blanche* sank and her cargo was lost, and some of her crew were drowned. The hopper was at the time being employed by the charterers, and was manned by a crew who were their servants. In an action in the Admiralty Division by the owners of *The Blanche*, the hopper was pronounced alone to blame for the collision. Sir John Jackson (Limited) thereupon brought the present action against the owners of *The Blanche* and all others interested, claiming, as "owners" of the hopper, a declaration of limitation of liability to £8 a ton under section 503, sub-section 1 (ii.), of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, and to £15 a ton under section 503, sub-section 1 (i.). The defendants contended that the plaintiffs were not the "owners" of the hopper so as to be entitled to a declaration of limitation of liability. Bargrave Deane, J., held that the plaintiffs were not the "owners" of the hopper within the meaning of the sections, and were not therefore entitled to a declaration of limitation of liability. The plaintiffs appealed.

The COURT (Sir GORELL BARNES, P., and FLETCHER MOULTON and KENNEDY, L.J.) dismissed the appeal.

Sir GORELL BARNES, P., said that at the time of the collision the plaintiffs had complete control of the hopper, but the legal ownership remained in the registered owners. There were some sections in the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, which imposed obligations or conferred rights upon the "owner or charterer," and that shewed that where the Legislature intended to include a charterer that word was used in addition to the word "owner." Upon looking at the Act as a whole, he came to the conclusion that the word "owner" in sections 503 and 504 was limited to a person who was the real owner of the ship, and did not include a charterer. This point could not arise when the Merchant Shipping Act, 1906, came into operation on the 1st of June, because by section 71 the word "owner" in the provisions in question of the Act of 1894 was to be deemed to include a charterer to whom the ship was demised.

FLETCHER MOULTON and KENNEDY, L.J., concurred.—COUNSEL, J. A. Hamilton, K.C., and Dawson Miller; A. D. Bateson and L. F. C. Darby, SOLICITORS, Thomas Cooper & Co., for Hill, Dickinson, & Co., Liverpool; Field, Rose, & Co., for Batesons, Warr, & Wimhurst, Liverpool.

[Reported by W. F. BARRY, Barrister-at-Law.]

"THE COMMONWEALTH." No. 1. 26th March.

INSURANCE, MARINE—VALUED POLICY ON SHIP—TOTAL LOSS—SUM INSURED LESS THAN VALUE IN POLICY—DAMAGES RECOVERED FROM SHIP IN FAULT—DIVISION BETWEEN SHIPOWNER AND UNDERWRITERS.

A ship was insured for £1,000, her value in the policy being stated to be £1,350. She was sunk by a collision with another ship, and the latter ship was

pronounced to blame. The value of the insured ship was assessed at £1,000, and this sum the wrongdoer paid into court. The underwriters, who had already paid the £1,000 to the owners of the insured ship for a total loss, claimed to be entitled to the £1,000 paid into court.

Held, that the owners of the insured ship were in the position of having been their own insurers for £350, and were entitled to $\frac{1}{3}$ of the £1,000.

Appeal from the judgment of Bargrave Deane, J. The schooner *Welsh Girl* was insured in the Dee Shipowners' Mutual Insurance Club for £1,000, the vessel being valued in the policy at £1,350. While so insured she was sunk by a steamship which afterwards turned out to be *The Commonwealth*. The insurance club paid the owners of *The Welsh Girl* the £1,000 policy-moneys, and brought an action in the name of the owners of *The Welsh Girl* against *The Commonwealth*, and the owners of *The Commonwealth* admitted liability for the damage caused by the collision. The claim was referred to the registrar, who assessed the value of *The Welsh Girl* at £1,000. This amount the owners of *The Commonwealth* paid into court, and a summons was taken out to determine how that sum ought to be divided between the owners of *The Welsh Girl* and the insurance club. The insurance club contended that, as they had paid £1,000 for a total loss, they were entitled to the £1,000. The owners contended that, as *The Welsh Girl* was valued at £1,350, they were their own insurers for £350, and that they were entitled to receive $\frac{1}{3}$ of the £1,000, and the insurance club were entitled to the balance. Bargrave Deane, J., upheld the contention of the owners of *The Welsh Girl*, and gave judgment for them. The insurance club appealed.

THE COURT (Sir GORELL BARNES, P., and FLETCHER MOULTON and KENNEDY, L.J.J.) dismissed the appeal. They held that the effect was the same as if there were two sets of underwriters, one set insuring for £1,000 and the other for £350. The only way to divide the £1,000 was in proportion to the liabilities so incurred. The owners of *The Welsh Girl* were in the same position as the underwriters for £350.—COUNSEL, Scrutton, K.C., D. Stephens, and R. A. Wright; Horridge, K.C., and Maurice Hill, SOLICITORS, W. W. Wynne & Sons, for H. Forshaw & Hawkins, Liverpool; Thomas Cooper & Co., for Hill, Dickinson, & Co., Liverpool.

[Reported by W. F. BARRY, Barrister-at-Law.]

WAKEFIELD AND DISTRICT LIGHT RAILWAY CO. v. MAYOR, &c., OF WAKEFIELD. No. 2. 21st March.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT—RATING—LIGHT RAILWAY—“USED ONLY AS A RAILWAY”—LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896 (59 & 60 VICT. C. 48), S. 12, SUB-SECTIONS 1, 2—PUBLIC HEALTH ACT, 1875 (38 & 39 VICT. C. 55), S. 211, SUB-SECTION 1 (B).

Section 12 (2) of the *Light Railways Act*, 1896, applies to light railways enactments in statutes which deal not with any particular railway, but speak of railways in general, though they deal with other subject-matter as well as railways, as, for example, section 211, sub-section 1 (b), of the *Public Health Act*, 1875. Inasmuch as the rateability of a light railway is based on the exclusive user for the purposes of a railway of the railway lines, the fact of the lines being laid along a public road does not prevent the land being used only for the purposes of a railway, so as to deprive it of the benefit of the exemption given by sub-section 1 (b) of section 211.

This was an appeal from a decision of the Divisional Court (Ridley Darling, and A. T. Lawrence, J.J.), which is reported 54 W. R. 495, 50 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL 420, on a special case stated by the Wakefield justices. The material facts as set forth in the case were as follows: The matter came before the justices on the complaint of the Corporation of Wakefield that the railway company, having been duly rated to certain general district rates, had refused to pay more than one-fourth of the sum assessed, on the ground that they were exempted from payment in full by section 211 of the *Public Health Act*, 1875. A copy of the rate was scheduled to the case, and therein the company was rated in respect of a certain light railway described as lines of rails. These rails were laid in certain enumerated public streets, and they were assessed at their full annual value. The light railway was authorized by the Wakefield and District Light Railway Order, 1901 (made by the Light Railway Commissioners in pursuance of the powers conferred on them by the *Light Railways Act*, 1896). The roads along which it ran were highways dedicated to the public and repairable by the inhabitants at large, and vested in the Wakefield Corporation as urban authority. The traffic was worked by electricity on what is commonly called the overhead system, and the vehicles were used for the conveyance of passengers and parcels on payment. It was contended for the corporation that the company was liable to pay on the full value (1) because the land on which the lines were laid was not land used only as a railway, and (2) that the railway was not a railway constructed under the powers of an Act of Parliament for public conveyance within the meaning of section 211 (*supra*). The justices upheld both these contentions, and ordered payment of the rate in full. Section 211 of the *Public Health Act*, 1875, is as follows: “With respect to the assessment and levying of general district rates under this Act the following provisions shall have effect: (b) The occupier of any land . . . used only as a canal or towing-path or as a railway constructed under the powers of any Act of Parliament for public conveyance shall be assessed in respect of the same in the proportion of one-fourth part only of the net annual value thereof.” The Divisional Court were of opinion that the land was used only as a railway, and that the railway was constructed under the powers of an Act of Parliament for public conveyance within section 211 of the *Public Health Act*, 1875. They accordingly allowed the appeal. From this decision the corporation now appealed.

THE COURT (COZENS-HARDY, M.R., and VAUGHAN WILLIAMS and BUCKLEY, L.J.J.) dismissed the appeal.

COZENS-HARDY, M.R., said that the case had been extremely well argued by counsel on both sides. The appellants, the Wakefield Corporation, contended that the respondents were rateable to the full amount charged by the general rate, and were not entitled to the exemption given to some railway companies by section 211 of the *Public Health Act*, 1875. When the matter was brought down to the material points, they seemed to resolve themselves into two. The first was whether section 12 of the *Tramways Act*, 1896, brought section 211 of the *Public Health Act*, 1875, into operation with reference to light railways; the second was, assuming this to be so, what was the effect of section 211 applied to a case like the present? They had to approach the question having regard to the fact that they were dealing with a railway and not a tramway. The first point was the effect of section 12 of the *Tramways Act*, 1896. That section ran as follows: “(1) The Clauses Acts as defined by this Act, and the enactments mentioned in the second schedule to this Act, shall not apply to a light railway authorized under this Act, except so far as they are incorporated or applied by the order authorizing the railway. (2) Subject to the foregoing provisions of this Act . . . the general enactments relating to railways shall apply to a light railway under this Act in like manner as they apply to any other railway, and for the purposes of those enactments . . . the light railway company shall be deemed a railway company, and the order under this Act a special Act, and any provision thereof a special enactment. Provided that a light railway shall not be deemed to be a railway within the meaning of the *Railway Passenger Duty Act*, 1842, and that no duties shall hereafter be levied in respect of passengers conveyed on a light railway constructed under this Act in respect of the conveyance of such passengers upon such railway.” It had been argued that the only enactments relating to railways which were to be applied to light railways were the general code of law applicable to railways and to railways only, and that sections were not to be applied which were of a general as distinguished from a special character, but which dealt, not with railways only, but with other matters as well. His lordship could not accede to that argument. The very exception of the *Railway Passenger Duty Act*, 1842, by the proviso to sub-section 2 of section 12 of the *Tramways Act*, 1896, seemed to show that that was far too narrow a construction, for when that Act was looked at it was plain that it did not deal merely with railways, but also with other matters such as stage coaches, and even with probate duties. But, in his view, even without the aid of the proviso, the words fairly construed must mean that an enactment in a statute dealing not with any particular railway, but speaking of all railways without exception, was to be applied to light railways. Then was section 211 of the *Public Health Act*, 1875, an enactment of that kind? His lordship thought that it was. It imposed rates on the occupiers of all kinds of property for the time being by law assessable to any rate for the relief of the poor and enacted that the rates should be assessed on the full net value of such property subject to certain exceptions. Then by sub-section (b) of sub-section 1 land used only as a railway constructed under the powers of any Act of Parliament for public conveyance was to be assessed only on one-fourth of its full net annual value. In his lordship's view, that was a general enactment relating to railways, a general enactment for the benefit of railways, to the benefit of which this light railway company was entitled. It was, therefore, necessary to consider whether the facts of the present case did or did not bring this light railway into the position of being able to claim the benefit of the sub-section. Now, section 211 was a charging section, and then came an exemption for certain occupiers of land, and it must be observed that the exemption was for the benefit of persons who but for it would have to pay rates. What, then, was the meaning of the words “occupier of any land . . . used only as a canal . . . or as a railway constructed under the powers of any Act of Parliament for public conveyance.” His lordship assumed that the word “only” applied not merely to “canal,” but also to “railway.” He thought that it was impossible to hold otherwise, having regard to the decision in *Blackpool and Fleetwood Tramways Co. v. Thornton Urban District Council* (ante, p. 227), and, speaking for himself, he would have arrived at the same conclusion if the matter had been open for decision. The next question was whether this was a railway constructed under the powers of an Act of Parliament. Mr. Lush had argued that it was not, but on his attention being called to the case of *Elve v. Boyton* (1891, 1 Ch. 501) he did not persist in that argument. Then was this company the occupier of land used only as a railway? His lordship thought that it was. The rateability of these light railway companies, and of tramway companies, which were physically the same as light railways, was expressed in the case of *Pimlico Tramways Co. v. Greenwich* (22 W. R. 87, L. R. 9 Q. B. 9) to be based on the ground, not that they used the road, as any one else might use it, but that they had, by virtue of the powers conferred on them by Parliament, the exclusive right to use a particular substance which was placed in or under the surface of the road; and it was by virtue of that right of exclusive use that they became rateable at all. If that was so the foundation of their rateability was their user of the groove in the rails into which the flange of the wheels fitted. That was occupation within the statute of Elizabeth and the principles of the rating law, and it was in respect of that that they were rateable. When you came to the words of sub-section (b) of sub-section 1 of section 211, the conclusion seemed irresistible that the exemption was given to the user of this land only as a railway. Now the company had got this land for the purpose of using as a railway, and only as a railway. He was not impressed by the argument that other people were entitled to use the surface of the road. Such a

user did not interfere with the exclusive right of user, which alone was the foundation of the company's rateability. For these reasons, which were substantially the reasons given by the learned judges of the Divisional Court, his lordship thought that the appeal ought to be dismissed.

VAUGHAN WILLIAMS and BUCKLEY, L.J.J., also delivered judgments dismissing the appeal.—COUNSEL, *Lush, K.C., Clavell Salter, K.C., and W. W. Mackenzie; Danckwerts, K.C., and Ryde, SOLICITORS, Sharpe, Parker, & Co., for W. W. Greenhalgh, Wakefield; Ashurst, Morris, Crisp, & Co.*

[Reported by J. I. STIRLING, Barrister-at-Law.]

Bankruptcy Cases.

Re WEINBERG. Ex parte THE OFFICIAL RECEIVER. Bigham, J.
20th March.

BANKRUPTCY—ENFORCING ATTENDANCE OF WITNESS FOR PRIVATE EXAMINATION—CONDUCT MONEY—BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1883 (46 & 47 VICT. c. 52), ss. 27, 142, 142—BANKRUPTCY RULES, 1886, 1890, rr. 62, 66, 71, 92, FORMS 149, 152, 164, 165.

When summons is taken out for the examination of a witness under section 27 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1883, such summons need not be personally served on the witness. Conduct money, to be measured by distance, is to be tendered with the summons in cash or postal orders. When a witness is arrested for non-compliance with the summons he can be detained in prison for a reasonable period until the examination can be held.

Application by the official receiver on a report of Mr. Registrar Linklater for directions as to the method of enforcing the attendance of a witness summoned to attend a private examination under section 27 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1883. Directions were asked upon the following points: (1) Is it necessary to serve a summons to attend for examination under section 27 personally upon the witness? (2) Does the "reasonable sum" which has to be tendered to the witness include compensation for loss of time, or is a tender of reasonable conduct money sufficient? (3) When a warrant is issued to apprehend the witness and bring him up for examination does it authorize the detention of the witness in custody until the examination can be held? Counsel for the official receiver stated that the practice had been to require personal service of a summons in the same way as a subpoena, but contended that the practice was wrong, and pointed out the difference in form between a subpoena (Form 149) and a summons under section 27 (Form 152), and the fact that there is a special rule requiring personal service of a subpoena (rule 62), where there is no such rule as to a summons. He also referred on this point to rule 66 and *Ex parte Hawkins, Re Bradbrook* (37 W. R. 700, 23 Q. B. D. 226). As to the "reasonable sum" he contended that conduct money only need be tendered to a witness before he comes; after he has come to the court he can apply for further compensation for loss of time. He referred to rule 71 and to *Re Batson* (1 Mans. 45) and *Chamberlain v. Stoneham* (38 W. R. 107, 24 Q. B. D. 113). With regard to the detention of a witness taken under a warrant to bring him up for examination the difficulty arose that the form of warrant (Form 165) is not addressed to "the governor or keeper" of any gaol as is the case in the warrant of committal for contempt (Form 164). The form did not seem to contemplate anything more than the arrest of the witness and his immediate transportation to the court to be examined, yet this was often impossible, and the witness had to be allowed to go free and so avoided examination.

BIGHAM, J., gave the following directions: (1) Personal service of the summons is not necessary, it may be served by post as directed by section 142 and rule 92. (2) Conduct money is all that the witness is entitled to before he comes to the court, and the amount thereof is to be measured by the distance which the witness has to come. It is to be sent with the summons in money or postal orders. (3) It is desirable that the officer who arrests the witness should be enabled to detain him for such reasonable period of imprisonment as may be necessary to ensure his attendance at the examination. What is a reasonable period will depend upon all the circumstances of each particular case. His lordship stated on the 22nd of March that he would write to the Board of Trade asking them to take the necessary steps to have the form of warrant altered so as to include a direction to the governor or keeper of a gaol to receive the witness into custody.—COUNSEL, *Hansell, SOLICITOR, The Solicitor to the Board of Trade.*

[Reported by P. M. FRANCIS, Barrister-at-Law.]

The dinner to be given by the members of the Northern Circuit to Lord Collins of Kensington, Lord Justice Kennedy, Mr. Justice Neville, and Mr. Justice Pickford will take place at the Whitehall Rooms, Hotel Métropole, on Saturday, at 7.30.

Mr. Manisty, K.C., Recorder of Berwick, was driving into Rothbury on Wednesday when the horse took fright and bolted. He was thrown out and, falling on his arm, dislocated the elbow. He is also suffering from shock. Mr. Manisty has returned to his home in London. The injury is not believed to be serious.

Another instance of freak legislation comes from Texas, says the *Evening Standard*, where a Bill is to be considered making it unlawful for a wage-earner to work more than twenty-six days in any month, under a heavy penalty. In Oklahoma a constitutional provision has been proposed, providing that all persons of good moral character may be admitted to practise law without examination, and allowing persons not lawyers to serve as county law judges.

Societies.

The Law Society.

A special general meeting of the members of the society will be held in the hall of the society on Friday, the 26th of April, at two o'clock, for the purpose hereinafter mentioned.

The PRESIDENT will present the prizes awarded to successful candidates for the Final Examination in January, 1907.

Mr. J. S. RUBINSTEIN will move (adjourned from the special general meeting held the 25th of January, 1907): "That this meeting desires strongly to urge on the Council the expediency of taking at once active steps to give effect to the many resolutions on the subject of the compulsory registration of the title to land passed during the last four years at various meetings of the society, and particularly the resolutions passed in April last regarding the urgent need of obtaining a suspension of the order applying the compulsory provisions of the Land Transfer Act, 1897, to the County of London, so that landowners in London may have an option to register or not as they deem best in their own interest."

Mr. G. H. RADFORD, M.P., will move: "That bye-law No. 40 be altered by the insertion after the word 're-election' of the words 'after the expiration of one year from the date of retirement.'"

Bye-law 40 is as follows: "On the day of the annual general meeting in each year, the ten members of the Council who have been longest in office shall go out of office, and their places shall be filled by election, and any case of doubt or difficulty arising as between members who have been in office for the same length of time shall be decided by agreement among those members, or, in default of agreement, then by lot. A retiring member is eligible for re-election. The outgoing members of the Council shall be considered as in office not only until the meeting shall break up or adjourn, but until others shall be respectively elected in their place."

Mr. CHARLES FORD will move: "That, in the opinion of this meeting, the long time that intervenes between the setting down and the hearing of actions in the King's Bench Division is such that the interests of suitors require that at least one additional judge ought to be forthwith appointed to that division to cope with the increasing arrear of actions waiting for trial, such delay tending to the trial of actions at the assizes which would otherwise be dealt with in London."

Mr. CHARLES FORD will ask: "When is the report of the special committee appointed by the society in consequence of misappropriation of trust funds by some dishonourable members of the profession likely to be laid before a general meeting of the society?"

Mr. CHARLES FORD will ask: "Whether, in view of the new bye-laws as to voting papers, the Council propose so to amend bye-law 34 as to make all resolutions passed at general meetings binding, subject to a poll of the members of the society if directed or demanded?"

Mr. W. P. W. PHILLIMORE will move: "That this meeting requests the Council to take immediate steps to obviate the very serious inconvenience caused to readers by the practice of eating, drinking, and smoking in all parts of the common room portion of the library."

E. W. WILLIAMSON, Secretary.

Law Students' Journal.

Council of Legal Education.

The following is the result of the general examination of students of the Inns of Court, held in Lincoln's-inn Hall, on the 19th, 20th, 21st, and 22nd of March. L.I. means Lincoln's-inn, I.T. Inner Temple, M.T. Middle Temple, and G.I. Gray's-inn:

ROMAN LAW.

The following students passed in Roman Law:

Class I.—Lennox Arthur Patrick O'Reilly, L.I.
Class II.—Cecil Rodolph Blake, L.I.; Ratnakrishna Curran Bonnerjee and Edwin Harold Britter, M.T.; Robert William Cassels and Rajendra Narayan Choudhuri, L.I.; Rabindranath Datta and Francis Carleton Greene, G.I.; Robert Hunter Hill and Maurice Gerald Holmes, I.T.; Evelyn John Maude, L.I.; William Watkins Morgan, I.T.; Mohindin Mohamed Narma, G.I.; Barrett Lennard Albemarle O'Malley, I.T.; Candido Onanfon, G.I.; Harold John Pullman and William Teulon Swan Sonnenchein, I.T.

Class III.—Badru Islam Ali Khan, G.I.; Herbert William Anderson, I.T.; Arjun Nath Atal, M.T.; Shaikh Abdul Aziz, L.I.; Chinamanal Bhudar Bhojuck, M.T.; Mohendro Bhattacharji, G.I.; Gilbert Eric Canman, I.T.; Krishna Raghunath Chandorkar, Ralph Charles Fairbairn Cotton, and Jibon Kumar Das Gupta, L.I.; Maurice Vigier de Latour, M.T.; William Greswell Dobson, I.T.; Harry Doncaster Dracott, M.T.; John Freeman Dunn and Anadi Chunder Dutt, G.I.; Frederick Fenton and Henry St. John Field, I.T.; William Forbes, G.I.; Noel William Freeman, I.T.; Robert Casper Goldston, Pierre Louis André Gourney, and Charles Wilton Wood Greenidge, M.T.; Hugh Greer, Wentworth Martyn Gurney, and Horace Perkins Hamilton, L.I.; George Charles Hancock, Henry Felix Hertz, Reginald Charles Cromwell Hockley, and Sir William Bulkeley Hughes Hughes-Hunter, M.T.; Hubert Hull, I.T.; Richard John Humphreys, G.I.; Mirza Mohammed Shakir Hussain, Sydney Douglas Selborne Jones, Thomas Alfred Jones, and Bhikaji Byramji Kanga, M.T.; Robert Walter Edmund Knollys, I.T.; Kewal Krishna, L.I.; Rasik Behari Lal, M.T.; Chanda Lall, I.T.; Alfred Letchworth Law, M.T.; Lionel Vincent Leach, L.I.; Adrian Leigh Lemon, Gilbert Conrad

Long
wary
Geo
Oliv
abha
M.T
Byra
M.T
Shai
Cam
Her
Cho
Pras
Pres
and
The
were
exam

Colo
Cl
Cl
Bey
Jam
Mac
L.I.
Cl
G.I.
Hug
Ratr
Alfre
Mou
Cott
Deas
Deva
Fred
Patr
Herb
John
M.T.
Hasi
Tayl
kins
sum
L.I.
Bens
Mulo
I.T.
Mac
Mac
Mang
and
Ferr
Denn
M.T.
Percy
Quar
Mirz
nand
Vina
Chun
G.I.
Herb
Trill
Gard
Alber

The
Proce
Cla
Alber
Cla
dathil
Thom
Berna
Johns
Lloyd
Nand
Willie
Cla
G.I.
Austin
L.I.;
Mauri
Robe
Charlt

Longstaff, and Mungo Lorenz MacCullum, I.T.; Girdhari Lall Maheshwary, G.I.; Suleiman Moosajji Manga, M.T.; Leonard Morgan May, L.I.; Geoffrey Moseley, I.T.; Basudha Kanta Nag, L.I.; Rupert Charles Ollivant, I.T.; Henry Bertram Ommaney, G.I.; Arunachalam Padmanabha, M.T.; Henry Arthur Payne, I.T.; Lancelot Pears and Pha Htaw, M.T.; Frederick John Pollock and Percy John Probyn, L.I.; Kaikhushro Byramjee Padumjee, Charles Clifton Roberts, and Syam Krishna Sahay, M.T.; Bankim Chandra Sen, L.I.; Narendra Nath Sen, Hirala Motilal Shah, and Mohammad Shareef, G.I.; Mohinder Singh, L.I.; Alan John Campbell Sington, I.T.; Keshari Prasad Sinha and Kow Soon Kim, M.T.; Herbert James Spratt, I.T.; Pestonji Cursetji Taraporwalla, L.I.; Mom Chow Thong-Chue and John Bevan Coulson Tregarthen, I.T.; Sukadeva Prasad Varma, M.T.; Robert Charles Owen Wells, I.T.; James Anstey Preston Wild, G.I.; Herbert Stewart Wilson, Albert Ernest Woodgate, and Percival Arthur Wixson, I.T.; Joseph Michael Xavier, M.T.

The number examined was 156, of whom 96 passed. Nine candidates were ordered not to be admitted for examination again until the Michaelmas examination, 1907.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW AND LEGAL HISTORY.

The following students passed in Constitutional Law (English and Colonial) and Legal History:

Class I.—Clement Milton Barber and James Victor Nesbitt, I.T.

Class II.—Samuel Josiah Sigismund Baratt, G.I.; Gilbert Hugh Beyfus, L.T.; Maurice Bonham-Carter, L.I.; Chuay Boon, G.I.; Charles James Gardner and Maurice Gerald Holmes, I.T.; Roderick Henry MacLeod, M.T.; DhiraJal Dayabhali Nanavati and Cyril Dunstan Shaw, L.I.; Charles John Sutton, M.T.

Class III.—Maung Bah Soe, M.T.; William George Beaumont-Edmonds, G.I.; Frederick William Beney, I.T.; Scott Birkbeck, L.I.; Thomas Hugh Conolly Blakie and Edward Henry Swinburne Bligh, I.T.; Ratnakrishna Curran Bonnerjee, M.T.; Henry James Casey, I.T.; John Alfred Chamberlain, G.I.; William Thomas Chapman, I.T.; Maung Chit Moung, M.T.; Evans Gustavus Cooper, G.I.; Ralph Charles Fairbairn Cotton, L.I.; Edward Maynard Coningsby Denny, G.I.; Govind Vinayek Deshmukh and Venkatesh Trimbakao Deshmukh, L.I.; Bertrand Ward Devas, I.T.; Horatio Aung Din, G.I.; William Greswell Dobson, I.T.; Frederick William Dunn, G.I.; Arthur Edgson, M.T.; Lucius George Patrick Eiffe, Frederick William Evans, Henry St. John Field, and Herbert William Sidney Francis, I.T.; Percy William French, M.T.; John Gadaby, I.T.; Charles Cyril Gerahy and Sailish Chandra Ghosh, M.T.; George Charles Guest, I.T.; Edward John Harding and Naziruddin Hasin, L.I.; Samuel Hawkins, M.T.; Gerard Odonel Heron, I.T.; Luke Taylor Hibbert, L.I.; Victor William John Hobbs, I.T.; Martin Hopkinson, L.I.; St. John Hutchinson, M.T.; Ibn-I-Ahmed, L.I.; Mansuram Das Jaini, G.I.; Harold Morton James, I.T.; Charles Jennings, L.I.; Robert William Johnston, I.T.; Henry Thomas Jones, G.I.; Benazir Jung, I.T.; Martin Schlesinger Kisch, Kewal Krishna, and Mulchand Ailmal Kundanani, L.I.; Chandu Lall and Adrian Lee Lemon, I.T.; William Lovelace and William Lowry, G.I.; Maxwell Henry Hayes Macartney, Mungo Lorenz MacCullum, and Nevil Collagh Mildred MacMahon, I.T.; Louis Fernand Maingard, M.T.; Alexander Anthony Mango, L.I.; Arthur Emmanuel Milne, G.I.; James Herbert Morell and Allan George Mossop, I.T.; Kidar Nath, G.I.; Eustace Marion Ferrers Nicholson, M.T.; Hon. Robert William Hugh O'Neill, I.T.; Dennis O'Sullivan, G.I.; Philip Charles Parry and Louis Raoul Perdran, M.T.; Ernest Heinrich Pistorius, I.T.; John Mervyn Pollen, M.T.; Percy John Probyn, Emmanuel Francis Quarrey, and Emmanuel William Quarrey-Papafio, L.I.; Paul Louis Quillet, Henry Milne Radcliffe, and Mirza Mohamed Rafi, M.T.; John Edward Raphael, L.I.; Philip Ferdinand Rosetteneistein and Garadee Rudrappa, G.I.; Maung San Wa, L.I.; Vinayak Damodar Savarkar and Prabhat Chandra Sen, G.I.; Sunan Chunder Sen, L.I.; Jotindra Mohan Sen Gupta and Hirala Motilal Shah, G.I.; Hafiz Mahmud Khan Shaikri, L.I.; Norman Matthew Shaw, G.I.; Herbert James Spratt, I.T.; William Stewart, M.T.; Harold Durham Trill and Charles Venables Vernon, I.T.; Madhav Krishna Wagle, Duncan Gardner Wallace, Charles Thomas Williams, and Dan Ifor Williams, M.T.; Albert Ernest Woodgate, I.T.

The special prize of £50 for the best examination in Constitutional Law (English and Colonial) and Legal History is awarded to James Victor Nesbitt, I.T. The number examined was 134, and 106 passed. One candidate was ordered not to be admitted for examination again until the Michaelmas examination, 1907.

EVIDENCE, PROCEDURE, AND CRIMINAL LAW.

The following students passed a satisfactory examination in Evidence, Procedure (Civil and Criminal) and Criminal Law:—

Class I.—Henry Delacombe Roome, M.T.; Mervyn Lawrence Tew, L.I.; Albert Ernest Woodgate, I.T.

Class II.—Razi Uddin Ahmad, Charles Haswell Campagnac, and Kandathil Koshy Chakko, M.T.; William Arthur Chance, G.I.; William Thomas Chapman, I.T.; Edward Fraser Hamilton Cox and Albert Beatus Bernard de Tscharner, M.T.; Abdul Hamid, L.I.; Robert William Johnston, I.T.; Faithful Edward Nottesford-Fortescue, L.I.; Victor Lloyd-Bostock, I.T.; Charles Frederick Cunningham Macaskie, Brahma Nand, and John Leighton Nanson, G.I.; Emile Roger Pezzani, M.T.; William Verling Sherlock and James Alexander George Smith, L.I.

Class III.—Syed Ahmad, M.T.; Manjori Ananta Patter Sundara Aiyar, G.I.; Martin Archer-Shee, I.T.; Arthur Neville Aston and Preston Bruce Austin, L.I.; Maung Bah Saing, M.T.; Richard de Beaumont Beamish, L.I.; Philip Leo Beard, G.I.; Thomas Hugh Conolly Blakie, I.T.; Maurice Bonham-Carter, L.I.; Sailindra Krishna Bose, G.I.; John Arthur Robert Cairns, M.T.; John Alfred Chamberlain, G.L.; Frederick William Charlton and Hon. Reginald Coke, I.T.; Richard Falbot Cox, M.T.;

Ronald Gordon Cruickshank, Leonard Taylor Dickinson, William Sydney Dixon, William Greswell Dobson, John Pascoe Elsten, and Charles James Gardner, I.T.; Israel Ginsberg, G.I.; Leslie Gordon, M.T.; Nagendra-nath Goswami, G.I.; Eugene Grant, L.I.; Weir London Greenies, Reginald Herbert Griffin, and Robert Francis Hanbury, I.T.; Robert Charles Percy Gerald Harvey, L.I.; Samuel Hawkins and Henry Felix Hertz, M.T.; James Philip Hodge, I.T.; Martin Hopkinson, L.I.; Edward Huise, Henry Percival Huise, and Cawasjee Burjorjee Jassawalla, M.T.; Kashi Prasad Jayaswal, and Mackertich Carapit Johannas, L.I.; James Laurence Young Keir, I.T.; Mulchand Ailmal Kundanani, L.I.; Benod Behari Lal, Herbert Edward Measor, and Kumar Gopal Menon, M.T.; James Herbert Morrell and Sholto Stuart Ogilvie, I.T.; Candido Ontanon, G.I.; David Robert Osborne, I.T.; Dennis O'Sullivan, G.I.; Edward Packer, M.T.; John Hugh Phillips, G.I.; Kakad Narayana Gopala Pillai, M.T.; Ernest Heinrich Pistorius, I.T.; Hamilton Rivers Pollock, M.T.; Mahabir Prasad, G.I.; John Edward Raphael, L.I.; George Gray Russell and Gustavus Charles Francis Schirrmeyer, I.T.; Prabhat Chandra Sen and Gur Prasad Sinha, G.I.; Charles Hope Sleigh and Leopold Bernhard Sommerfeld, M.T.; Irach Jehangir Sorabji, G.I.; Ferioli St. Regis Surita, L.I.; Mohanlal Varma, G.I.; Nowrojee Jehangir Wadia, L.I.; Madhav Krishna Wagle, M.T.; Robert Willis, I.T.; Richard Bethell Wilson, Henry Buckley William Wynyard, and Percy Allan Yearwood, L.I.; Charles Nathan Silver Zeffertti, M.T.

The special prize of £50 for the best examination in Evidence, Procedure, and Criminal Law is awarded to Henry Delacombe Roome, M.T. One candidate was ordered not to be admitted for examination again until the Michaelmas examination, 1907. The number examined was 112, and 92 passed.

FINAL EXAMINATION.

Class I. (in order of merit).—Arthur Cecil Caporn, M.T.; Albert Ernest Woodgate, I.T.; Promothonath Dutt, M.T.; Charu Chunder Ghose, L.I.; Vinayak Govind Bapat, M.T.; George William Henry Jones, G.I., who all receive certificates of honour.

Class II. (in order of merit).—Frank Bruce Burchell, Bernard Alexander, William Henry Cartwright Sharp, Kaye Aspinall Ramsden Sudgen, and William Greswell Dobson, I.T.; William Verling Sherlock, L.I.; Thomas Arthur John Pile, M.T.; Walter Baird Martin, I.T., and Shiekh Abdul Rahman, M.T. (the last two bracketed equal); Francis Peabody Croshaw, I.T.; William Sumner Gibson, L.I.; Cecil Herbert Edward Chubb and Raymond Walter Needham, M.T. (the last two bracketed equal); Herbert Phillips and William Mortimer Robertson Malherbe, M.T.; Bernard Compton Ferrers and George Thomas, I.T.; Francis à Court Bergne and John Flowers, I.T. (the last two bracketed equal); and William Florey Noyce and Henry Vivian Phillips, L.I. (bracketed equal).

Class III. (in alphabetical order).—Shaikh Mashid Uddin Ahmad and Mohamed Azumuz, M.T.; Edmund Lyndon Barnes, I.T.; William Beardmore, M.T.; Henry Soady Bell, L.I.; Thomas Hugh Duncan Bell, David Runciman Boyd, George Andrew Buchanan, Hon. Elidor Ronald Campbell, Edward Tankerville Chamberlayne, Hugh Cloudaley, Clement John Fromanteel Cobbold, and Richard Dudley Craig, I.T.; Albert Crew, G.I.; Adolf Davis and Augustus Robert Vincent Dimmer, M.T.; Edward Duke, G.I.; William Augustus Evans, I.T.; William Murray Graham, L.I.; Richard Reader Harris, G.I.; Charles Basil Mortimer Hodgson, I.T.; Charles Joseph Alexander Hoskins and Ezra Isaac Joseph Hyam, M.T.; Shaikh Muhammad Iqbal, L.I.; Walter Thomas Ivimey, I.T.; Parmeshwar Lall, M.T.; Frederick Oswald Langley, I.T.; Alfred Henry Lionel Leach, M.I.; Kenneth Mead Macmorran, M.T.; Khagendra Nath Majumdar, G.I.; Alexander Anthony Mango and Suraj Narain, L.I.; Samuel Ndubuisi-Lewis, I.T.; Vaman Shankar Pandit, L.I.; Francis Westby Perceval, I.T.; Govinda Padmanabha Pillai, M.T.; Victor Robert Pochin, L.I.; Albert Weston Priestley, G.I.; Shaikh Abdul Quadir, L.I.; Khushi Ram and Gervais Squire Chittick Rentoul, G.I.; Joseph Royeppen, Herbert David Samuels, David White, and James Edmund White, L.I.; Harry Mortimer Wise, M.T.; James Dawbarn Young, G.I.; Meredith Young, L.I.

The number examined was 83, and 75 passed.

Companies.

Legal and General Life Assurance Society.

ANNUAL MEETING.

The annual general meeting of the Legal and General Life Assurance Society, was held on Tuesday at the chief offices, 10, Fleet-street, Mr. RICHARD PENNINGTON, J.P., one of the trustees, taking the chair.

Mr. E. COLQUHOUN (actuary and manager) having read the notice convening the meeting,

The CHAIRMAN moved the adoption of the report. He observed that since the last annual meeting, the board had had to regret the loss of four of its members. Lord Davey would long be had in remembrance by the whole legal profession. He was a lawyer of marked distinction, and his great knowledge of affairs and legal skill had enabled him to give advice which was of much value to the society. Mr. Claude Baggallay's early death had been much regretted. His kindly disposition and unostentatious manners had been highly appreciated. It was more difficult for him to speak of Mr. William Williams. He had known him as a kind friend for a generation past, and he had been even longer known at the board, where as a director, deputy chairman, and chairman, he had earned a reputation only seconded by that which had distinguished him as a member of the legal profession. Mr. G. E. Frere had unhappily been compelled through

ill-health to retire, and his sad affliction had evoked the warm sympathy of all who knew him. Turning to the accounts, he said he was glad to say that the accounts for 1906, the last year of the quinquennium, would compare favourably with those of the four preceding years. The total policies issued in the year were 3,089 as against 2,604 in 1905, and the net sums assured were, in the life department £2,361,848 against £2,159,720 in the previous year, and the premiums were £117,124 as against £116,430. These figures included the general fund which last year secured £219,657 net sums assured at premiums of £13,126 as against £56,072 at premiums of £2,707 in 1905. The consideration money received for annuities had not been so large in 1906 as in 1905, being £131,903 as against £172,336 in the previous year. On the other hand, the interest and dividends had increased from £147,888 to £157,013. On the other side of the account the claims caused by 118 deaths amounted to £269,752 as against £191,811 caused by 125 deaths in 1905. There were also claims of £19,788 due to matured endowments as against £7,617 in 1905. The average claim in 1906 worked out £2,286, against £1,534 in 1905, and the actual claims considered as a percentage of the death claims provided for by the tables employed in the valuation amounted to only 84 per cent. of the expectation. The surrenders were somewhat larger than last year, and the outgo for annuities, of course, increased in amount. The result of the year's working was to shew an increase of £373,861 in the Life Assurance Fund, which now amounted to £5,116,498. The general account called for little remark. The premiums had increased by £8,370.

Mr. ROMER WILLIAMS seconded the motion, and it was carried unanimously.

On the motion of the CHAIRMAN, seconded by Mr. ROMER WILLIAMS, Mr. G. E. Frere, who retired under the provisions of the deed of settlement, was re-elected a director, as were the directors who retired by rotation as follows: His Honour Judge Bacon, Mr. Arthur J. Finch, Mr. A. Grant Mack, J.P., Mr. Chas. P. Johnson, Mr. Wm. Hy. Saltwell, and Mr. R. W. Tweedie.

The retiring auditors, Messrs. Deloitte, Plender, Griffiths, & Co., were also re-elected.

BONUS MEETING.

An extraordinary general meeting was then held, and the CHAIRMAN moved the bonus report. He observed that the salient features of the present valuation were the improvement in the rate of interest, the fall in convertible securities, and the favourable mortality experience. At the last bonus meeting he had expressed a hope that the decline in the rate of interest was arrested, and that we might look forward to some improvement. This hope had, he was glad to say, been realized, but concurrently only with a continuous fall in the price of what were called gilt-edged securities, and it was clear that as trustee securities were mostly, if not entirely, fixed interest-bearing securities, a rise in the return from them implied a fall in their price. The investments other than convertible securities were the cause of constant solicitude and examination by the directors. The directors were satisfied that this portion of the assets was fully secured. With regard to the balance—the convertible securities—you can form your opinion from the particulars given. At the same time that the board deplored the continued fall in convertible securities, that very fall offers excellent opportunities for the investment of the society's rapidly increasing funds, and had also, of course, a reflex action upon the rate of interest obtainable on mortgages and other forms of investment other than convertible securities, and also enabled the board to obtain a higher rate of interest upon the society's other securities. The result of these various causes was shewn in the increase of the rate of interest earned in the present quinquennium to £4 6s., as against £4 2s. 2d. in the previous period. Another most important factor in the profits was the mortality, and the mortality over the whole five years had been only 77 per cent. of that expected and provided for by the tables by which the board valued, and what was of equal importance, not only had the mortality been favourable but the incidence had also been favourable, and the society had realized a considerable profit from this source. Turning to the valuation, this had been calculated, as on the two last occasions, at 2½ per cent., notwithstanding the increase in the interest rate, and it would be readily understood, with the rapidly growing funds and low valuation rate, what a large source of profit surplus interest represented in the society's affairs. Two valuations had been made, both at 2½ per cent. The first on a pure or net premium basis, and, with a view of avoiding any possibility of negative values, the second on the basis of valuing 82 per cent. only of the with-profit premiums and 90 per cent. of the non-profit. The reserves brought out by the latter method, being very much larger than by the net premium valuation, had been adopted. To these figures had been added all the usual additional reserves, with the result that the total net liability was shewn as £4,663,390—it was £3,374,517 on the last occasion—and, as the assurance fund amounted to £5,116,498, a total surplus of £476,965 was brought out, bringing into account, of course, the sums paid away as interim bonus on those with-profit policies that became claims in the period. The similar surplus at the last division was £376,545. With regard to the distribution of this surplus, after very careful consideration, the directors thought that the sum of £470,324 might be safely divided, leaving £6,641 1s. 2d. to be carried forward. The directors thought it only just to divide the surplus shewn among those persons whose contributions had provided it, after every provision for the future that extreme prudence could suggest had been made. If the meeting approved of the division of £470,324, it would be divided as follows: One-tenth to the proprietors, viz., £47,032 8s., and £423,291 12s. to the policy-holders. Of this sum they had already received £23,857 as interim bonus, and £399,434 12s. remained to be now distributed. These sums would provide to the shareholders 17s. 6d. a share for this year and the four succeeding years, and to the policy-holders a compound

bonus at the same rate as on the last two occasions, viz.: 38s. per cent. compound. He thought the meeting would agree with him that the result of the valuation was very satisfactory, and should increase the reputation the society enjoyed for stability and high bonuses.

Mr. ROMER WILLIAMS seconded the motion, and it was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN, responding to a vote of thanks to the board, which also included the officers and staff, testified to the enormous amount of trouble that was taken and the great zeal which was shewn by Mr. Colquhoun and the members of the staff in carrying on the business of the society.

Obituary.

Mr. W. J. Beckingsale.

We have been favoured with the following information additional to our short notice last week:

By the death of Mr. William Jefferies Beckingsale, of Newport, Isle of Wight, which took place after a brief illness, at his residence, Fairlee House, near Newport, on the 29th ult., the profession loses one of its oldest members. Mr. Beckingsale was the younger son of the late Mr. William Jefferies Beckingsale, surgeon, of the city of Salisbury, and was born on the 4th of December, 1811. After being educated in France, he was articled to the late firm of Messrs. Coombes, of Salisbury, and subsequently to the late firm of Messrs. Holme & Co., of New-inn. He was admitted in 1835, and not long afterwards commenced practice at Newport, where he continued his long professional career, and personally conducted his business there until within three weeks of his decease. Mr. Beckingsale took an early interest in politics, being actively engaged in the election for the city of Salisbury in 1832; and was for nearly forty years the recognized Liberal agent for the county of the Isle of Wight and for the borough of Newport. A keen sportsman, he was in his prime a well-known follower of the Isle of Wight foxhounds, and had the reputation of being one of the finest and straightest riders in the island. He kept up his interest in the chase to the last, and was accustomed to drive to the meets of the hounds until within two months of his death. Mr. Beckingsale was at the time of his decease a vice-president of the Isle of Wight Law Society.

Mr. Frederick Bowker.

Mr. Frederick Bowker, solicitor, of Winchester, died on Tuesday, at the age of ninety-two. He was, we believe, a native of London, and was admitted in Hilary Term of 1836, and practised for over sixty years. He was the family solicitor to the Tichborne family, on whose behalf he successfully contested Orton's claim.

Sir Samuel Hall, K.C.

Sir Samuel Hall, K.C., died at St. Leonards-on-Sea on Saturday last. He was a son of the late Mr. Samuel Hall, of Leftwich, Cheshire. He was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, and in 1870 was called to the bar. He took silk in 1888, and in 1893 was made a bencher of his inn. In the latter year he became Attorney-General for the Duchy of Lancaster, and after holding that office for two years was created Vice-Chancellor of the County Palatine of Lancaster, a post which he held till 1905, and we believe earned much popularity with the counsel and solicitors practising before him.

Mr. A. Percival.

Mr. Andrew Percival, solicitor, of Peterborough, died on Thursday in last week in his ninetieth year. He was the son of a physician at Northampton, and was articled to Mr. John Gates, of Peterborough. He was admitted in 1839, and became a partner with Mr. Gates, whose daughter he married. He was one of the first aldermen of the city under the new charter, and in 1876-7 served the office of mayor. He was many years ago coroner for the City and Liberty of Peterborough, and had a large private practice. He was a keen sportsman and a member of the Fitzwilliam Hunt, and he was one of the honorary treasurers of the Peterborough Cathedral Restoration Fund.

Mr. F. H. Colt.

We regret to announce the death, on the 29th ult., of Mr. Frederick Hoare Colt, barrister-at-law, in his eighty-second year. Mr. Colt was the son of Mr. Nathaniel Colt, of Cheltenham. He was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, and was called to the bar in 1853. For a long period he had an excellent practice, both court and conveyancing, but of late years his increasing deafness had interfered with his work in court. He was for many years editor of the *Law Journal Reports*, and was a bencher of the Inner Temple.

Mr. Justice Warrington has quite recovered from the accident he met with a few weeks ago while viewing some experiments in connection with a patent action, but we greatly regret to hear that Lord Justice Farwell is still very unwell.

The International Law Association will hold its twenty-fourth conference at Portland, Maine, U.S.A., on the 29th, 30th, and 31st of August. The conference has been arranged on the invitation of the American Bar Association, the annual meeting of which body has been fixed for the three days immediately preceding the above dates.

Legal News.

Appointment.

MR. GEORGE FREDERICK DURRANT PRESTON, solicitor, has been appointed Clerk to the Justices of Yarmouth, vacant through the death of Mr. Charles Diver, who had held the appointment for twenty-three years.

Changes in Partnerships.

Dissolutions.

ROBERT FISHER THOMPSON and JOHN FREDERICK HODGSON, solicitors (R. F. Thompson & Hodgson), Kendal and Barrow-in-Furness. Jan. 18. The said Robert Fisher Thompson will continue to carry on the said practice at Kendal aforesaid, in his own name, and the said John Frederick Hodgson will continue to carry on the said practice at Barrow-in-Furness, in his own name. *[Gazette, April 5.]*

WILLIAM JAMES LAKE and LIONEL LEY, solicitors (Ley, Lake, & Ley), 61, Carey-street, Lincoln's-inn, London. March 31.

EZEKIEL CHARLES PETGRAVE and RICHARD EVELYN BETHELL HAYDON, solicitors (Petgrave & Haydon), Bath. March 5. The said Ezekiel Charles Petgrave will continue to practise at 4, Harington-place, and the said Richard Evelyn Bethell Haydon will practise at 6, Wood-street, Bath.

[Gazette, April 9.]

General.

Sir Charles Mathews will preside at the annual dinner of the Central Criminal Court Bar Mess, which will take place at the Trocadero Restaurant on Wednesday evening, the 17th inst.

Mr. Justice Bigham has fixed Tuesday, the 30th inst., and following days, if necessary, for the next sittings of the Railway and Canal Commission Court, at the Royal Courts of Justice.

The present list of House of Lords appeals contains, says the *Times*, the names of fourteen cases, nine of which are English, three are Irish, and two are Scotch appeals. The hearing of these cases will be resumed very shortly.

It is announced that Mr. Justice Bucknill will sit in the Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Court until further notice, in place of the President, who will sit in the Appeal Court for the present, in place of Lord Justice Farwell, who is still indisposed.

A justice of the peace in one of the inland counties of the State of Ohio, says the *Central Law Journal*, was a farmer and an original character. John H. King and Henry C. Dickinson, both now deceased, were trying a case before him. When the attorneys arrived at his farm the justice came in from the cornfield, where he had been hoeing corn, bareheaded and barefooted. He listened to the evidence, and when the attorneys were about to argue the case, the justice said: "Gentlemen, you may now proceed to argue this case, and I will go out now and finish my hoeing corn, and when you get through with the argument you will find my decision in the drawer of my desk," and walked out, leaving the attorneys to argue the case between themselves.

A dramatic scene, resulting in the triumphant acquittal of an innocent man, was, says the *Daily Mail*, witnessed in the Neath (Glamorganshire) police-court, on Tuesday, when, after repeated remands in custody, Giles Jones, a well-known colliery manager, and until recently a member of the Neath Board of Guardians, was again charged with committing a burglary at the grocer's shop of Mr. H. L. Thomas, and stealing £1. It appears that Mr. W. H. David, solicitor for the defence, spent some hours on Saturday night in endeavouring to elucidate the mystery of a pair of pincers, upon which the police were relying, and about midnight he found the actual burglar in a Neath slum. At the close of his address in court on Tuesday, Mr. David caused a sensation by announcing that he would call as witness the person who committed the burglary. David Jones, a youth, then stepped into the box, and gave a detailed account of the burglary, describing how he entered the premises and his subsequent movements. Prosecuting counsel having stated that he was satisfied that the boy's story was true, left the matter in the hands of the bench. In discharging the accused, the mayor said that the solicitor for the defence had proved himself more clever than the police.

At the Whitechapel County Court, on Tuesday, says the *Daily Telegraph*, Mr. Hart mentioned the fact to Judge Bacon that he was not the solicitor on the record, and was appearing on behalf of a firm of solicitors in Leicester. He had only received the papers that morning at his office. —Judge Bacon: The solicitors ought to know better. It is an attempt to evade the Act of Parliament.—Mr. Hart said he was aware of the Act. As a matter of fact, it was the common practice among solicitors in all the courts he was acquainted with.—Judge Bacon inquired if Judge Snagge, who presides over the circuit in which Leicester is included, allowed it.—Mr. Hart: I cannot say that, your Honour. I can only speak of the courts I am acquainted with.—Judge Bacon: If that is so, solicitors are all tarred with the same brush. You are attempting to drive a coach and four through an Act of Parliament. I will allow you to appear to-day as the agent; but you had better write to the firm telling them that you were their agent and not their solicitor. I do this

in your interests, because, first, it is the law, and, secondly, it is in the interest of solicitors themselves.—Mr. Hart said he had treated the court with candour.—Judge Bacon: Certainly. Solicitors are officers of the court, and it is only what I expect from them.

MR. G. M. ARNOLD, Mayor of Gravesend, sends to the *Times* a translation of an ancient charter-party as follows: "Know all those who shall see and hear this charter that Sir Hugh de Berham, in the name and place of Sir Adam de Limbergue, Constable of the Castle of Bordeaux, and on behalf of our Lord the King of England, Duke of Guienne, and in the name and place of our said Lord the King, and Duke, has freighted and laden at Bordeaux, the Coq, 'our Lady of Lyme,' of Walter Giffard, the Master, 93 Tuns and 18 pipes of Wine, whereof are one Tun 4 pipes of Stock Wine, and 44 Tuns of Flour, to go to Newcastle-on-Tyne straightway, for 9 shillings of good Crown sterlings of England, each tun of freight at the rate of 21 Tuns 1 pipe for 20, and the residue of the pipes 2 for the freight of one Tun. For which freights the said Master acknowledges that he was paid in the sum of £7 2s. 0d. of good Crown sterlings of England in part payment of the said freight, and held himself thereof well paid. And within fifteen days, counting one day after another, after God, he shall have conducted and brought the said ship across to safety to her right discharge. The wine and flour shall be discharged, and the Master paid for all his freight without any delay and without any demurrage. Towsage and petty lade manage are on the Merchants. And when the ship left Bordeaux the Master and the Merchants were in good peace, and in good love, and without any quarrel. That is to say, the 8th day from the end of May A.D. 1322."

Winding-up Notices.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, April 5.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

BARRETT'S BREWERY AND BOTTLING CO., LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before May 1, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Mr. Edwin de Gruchy and Mr. Edward Herbert Crick, 71, Bond st, South Lambeth, Ashurst & Co, Throgmorton av, solors for liquidators.

BRITISH ELECTRIC EQUIPMENT CO., LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented March 26, directed to be heard April 16. Webb & Co, Budge row, solors for petitioners. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of April 15.

HIGHGATE HILL TRANWAYS, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented March 27, directed to be heard April 16. Brown & Co, Finsbury pyramid, solors for petitioners. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of April 15.

IMPROVED ELECTRIC SUPPLIES, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented March 26, directed to be heard April 16, at 10.30. Evans & Co, Theobald's rd, Bedford row, solors for petitioners. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of April 15.

OTTO ELECTRICAL MANUFACTURING CO., LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before April 27, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to John William Beever, 17, Cooper st, Manchester, liquidator.

REJUVENOIDS, LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before May 24, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to John William Walter, 27, Clement's in, liquidator.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, April 9.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

ASHANTI MINES, LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before May 21, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to William Henderson Walker, 42, Castle st, Liverpool. Colling & Co, Liverpool, solors for liquidator.

CAMBRIDGE MOTOR OMNIBUS CO., LIMITED (IN LIQUIDATION).—Creditors are required, on or before May 10, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to William Rowe Elworthy, 7, Downing st, Cambridge, liquidator.

COOK'S ATHLETIC CO., LIMITED (IN LIQUIDATION).—Creditors are required, on or before May 6, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Oswald Harry Snaselle, 35, Craven st, Strand, liquidator.

L. W. CAREY & CO., LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before May 15, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Ernest L. Walker, 5, Castle st, Liverpool. Simpson & Co, Liverpool, solors for liquidator.

Court Papers.

Supreme Court of Judicature.

ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON

Date.	EMERGENCY ROTA.	APPEAL COURT No. 2.	Mr. Justice KERSHAW.	Mr. Justice JOYCE.
Monday, April 15	Mr. Leach	Mr. Goldschmidt	Mr. Grewell	Mr. Church
Tuesday	Grewell	Theed	Leach	King
Wednesday	Borres	Goldschmidt	Grewell	Church
Thursday	Bioxam	Theed	Leach	King
Friday	Theed	Goldschmidt	Grewell	Church
Saturday	Goldschmidt	Theed	Leach	King
Date	Mr. Justice SWINSON MARY.	Mr. Justice WASHINGTON.	Mr. Justice NEVILLE.	Mr. Justice PARKER.
Monday, April 15	Mr. Beal	Mr. Bioxam	Mr. Carrington	Mr. King
Tuesday	Farmer	Borres	Pemberton	Church
Wednesday	Beal	Bioxam	Carrington	Pemberton
Thursday	Farmer	Borres	Pemberton	Carrington
Friday	Beal	Bioxam	Carrington	Farmer
Saturday	Farmer	Borres	Pemberton	Beal

Sowler & Sons Ltd appl of P G Andrews from order of Mr Justice Warrington, dated Aug 8, 1906 (produce order) (s o for appointment of legal personal representative) Aug 21

1906

In re J F Boswell, dec Merritt v Boswell appl of M S Emerson from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Jan 30, 1906 (s o for appln to Joyce, J) Feb 16

Harding v King appl of deft W J Harding King from order of Mr Justice Buckley, dated Aug 5, 1906 March 5

Thellusson v Valentia appl of pltf from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated Feb 22, 1906 (s o apply to restore) March 12

The Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the Borough of Bournemouth and The Mayor, &c, of Poole and The Urban District Council of Branksome v The Poole District Electric Traction Co Ltd appl of defts from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated March 5, 1906 June 1

Consolidated Pneumatic Tool Co Ltd v Clark, Tierney and anr appl of pltf from order of Mr Justice Warrington, dated May 28, 1906 June 20 Same v Sir W Armstrong, Whitworth & Co Ltd and ors appl of pltf from order of Mr Justice Warrington, dated May 28, 1906 June 20 Same v Ingersoll Sergeant Drill Co and anr appl of pltf from order of Mr Justice Warrington, dated May 28, 1906 (fixed for April 29, by order) June 20

In re Edmund Noakes, dec Noakes v Noakes and ors appl of pltf from order of Justice Buckley, dated June 15, 1906 July 9

Fourne & Tant v Salmon & Gluckstein Ltd appl of defts from order of Mr Justice Buckley, dated July 4, 1906 July 16

In re Hutchinson, dec Rome v Rome appl of pltf from order of Mr Justice Warrington, dated March 26, 1906 July 16

The Daimler Motor Co (1904) Ltd The London Daimler Co Ltd appl of pltf from order of Mr Justice Buckley, dated July 25, 1906 Aug 1

Buckler v Inch and anr appl of pltf from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated June 21, 1906 Oct 4

Willoughby v Paulet appl of pltf from order of Mr Justice Neville, dated June 23, 1906 Oct 12

In re John Barnabas Robbins, dec H J Robbins v H A Legg and ors appl of pltf from order of Mr Justice Swinfen Eady, dated Aug 9, 1906 Oct 22

In the Matter of Musical Composition entitled the "Liedertafel Series of Carols," &c., &c., and in the Matter of the Copyright Act, 1842 appl of Reid Bros Ltd from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated July 27, 1906 Oct 27

The Shaftesbury Art Gallery Ltd v Barton Wright appl of deft from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated July 18, 1906 Oct 29

Edgar v Gill appl of deft from order of Mr Justice Buckley, dated July 11, 1906 Nov 2

The Peak Hill Gold Fields Ltd v Simpson and ors appl of deft from order of Mr Justice Warrington, dated Aug 8, 1906 (security ordered) Nov 7

In re Slater, dec Slater v Slater appl of deft from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated June 27, 1906 Nov 9

Shephard and ors v Bray and ors appl of defts (Bray's Executors) from order of Mr Justice Warrington, dated July 17, 1906 Nov 9

Shepherd and ors v Bray and ors appl of defts (Gaunt's Executors) from order of Mr Justice Warrington, dated July 17, 1906, and cross-notice by pltf, dated Nov 13, 1906 Nov 9

In re Richard Wakefield, dec Porter v Wakefield appl of deft from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Oct 26, 1906 Nov 13

Ankerson v Connelly appl of deft from order of Mr Justice Warrington, dated July 25, 1906 Nov 17

In re Yates, dec Throckmorton v Pike appl of defts E F Merriman and anr from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated Aug 9, 1906 Nov 19

In re J W M Baillie, dec Braithwaite v Baillie and ors appl of defts from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Nov 27, 1906 Dec 8

The Star Cycle Co Ltd v Frankenberg appl of pltf from order of Mr Justice Swinfen Eady, dated Nov 16, 1906 Dec 11

Switer v Switer appl of deft from order of Mr Justice Warrington, dated Nov 7, 1906 Dec 12

J B Brooks & Co Ltd v Rendall, Underwood & Co Ltd appl of defts from order of Mr Justice Swinfen Eady, dated Nov 10, 1906 Dec 13

The Northam Bridge and Roads Co v South Stoneham Rural District Council appl of defts from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated Nov 26, 1906 Dec 15

Neave v B N C Ltd and ors Bohn v Neave and ors appl of E Bohn from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated Nov 23, 1906 (produce order) Dec 15

In the Matter of William Simeon Jerome, Gentleman, Solicitor of the Supreme Court appl of petnr A A Croxford from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Dec 5, 1906 Dec 21

In re Beyfus & Beyfus, Solicitors of the Supreme Court appl of A and P Beyfus from order of Mr Justice Swinfen Eady, dated Oct 29, 1906 Dec 22

Martin v The Consett Iron Co Ltd appl of pltf from order of Mr Justice Swinfen Eady, dated Nov 17, 1906 Dec 31

1907

In re John Edwards, dec Edwards v Edwards appl of deft from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Nov 20, 1906 Jan 1

In re Turner, dec Wood and anr v Turner and ors appl of Minchin & Co from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Nov 29, 1906 Jan 4

Saqui & Lawrence v The Metropolitan Ry Co appl of pltf from order of Mr Justice Parker, dated Nov 21, 1906 Jan 4

Burn v Negus appl of deft from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Dec 18, 1906 Jan 8

In re Lyle & Kinahan's Application, No 264,958, and In re Kinahan & Co

ld, opposition thereto, No 3,809, and in the Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Acts, 1883 to 1902 appl of Kinahan & Co Ltd from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Nov 21, 1906 (produce order) Jan 12

In re Sampson, dec Robbins and ors v Alexander and anr appl of defts from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Nov 27, 1906 Jan 15

In re Frederick George Lister, dec Hartley v Nicholson appl of deft from order of Mr Justice Neville, dated Nov 10, 1906 Jan 15

In the Matter of the Companies Acts, 1882 to 1900 In the Matter of the Kent County Gas Light and Coke Co Ltd (ex parte Brown and ors) appl of the Kent County Gas Light, &c, from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated Nov 28, 1906 Jan 14

In the Matter of the Companies Acts Same v Same (ex parte Bradsell and ors) appl of the Kent County Gas Light, &c, from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Dec 22, 1906 Jan 16

In the Matter of the Companies Acts Same v Same (ex parte Gollmann) appl of the Kent County Gas Light, &c, from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Dec 22, 1906 (produce order) Jan 16

In the Matter of the Companies Acts Whitaker v Same appl of the Kent County Gas Light, &c, from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Dec 22, 1906 Jan 16

In re Mary Maughan, dec Bernard v Fawcett appl of deft from order of Mr Justice Warrington, dated Nov 7, 1906 Jan 16

Marrian's Trustees and anr v Swann & Poland appl of defts from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated Nov 1, 1906 Jan 21

In re Trowell, dec Harvey and ors v Waller and ors appl of pltf from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Nov 30, 1906 Jan 24

National Phonograph Co Ltd v Edison Bell Consolidated Phonograph Co Ltd and ors appl of pltf company from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated Dec 15, 1906 Jan 25

Dott v Brickwell and anr appl of defts from order of Mr Justice Swinfen Eady, dated Nov 13, 1906 Jan 29 The following Bankruptcy Appeal from the King's Bench Division to come on with above (order, dated Feb 21, 1907) In re A Debtor (expte The Debtor), No 14 of 1907 from a Receiving Order made by Mr. Registrar Gifford on 29th Jan, 1907

Attorney-General v Mathieson appl of Attorney-General from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Dec 11, 1906 Jan 21

In re Wilkinson and Fell's Contract and In re Vendor and Purchaser Act, 1874 appl of purchaser C H Fell from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Dec 11, 1906 (produce order) Jan 31

In re T C Ingledew, dec Beddome and anr v Abbott and ors appl of Caledonian Insce Co from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated Jan 16, 1907 Feb 8

Newellite Glass Tile Co Ltd v Lawson's Non-Conducting Composition Ltd appl of pltf from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Jan 18, 1907 Feb 11

The Society of Accountants and Auditors v Goodway appl of deft from order of Mr Justice Warrington, dated Jan 31, 1907 (produce order) Feb 11

Switer v Brewster appl of pltf from order of Mr Justice Parker, dated Nov 14, 1906 Feb 12

In re Joseph Grange, dec Chadwick v Grange appl of deft from order of Mr Justice Parker, dated Jan 16, 1907 Feb 14

In re N G Clayton, dec Clayton v Clayton appl of pltf from order of Mr Justice Parker, dated Jan 16, 1907 Feb 15

Hill v Clifford appl of pltf from order of Mr Justice Warrington, dated Feb 19, 1907 Feb 21

In re Smith's Settlement Jacob Smith and anr v Smith and ors appl of defts from order of Mr Justice Parker, dated Jan 30, 1907 Feb 25

In re William Wilson, dec Wilson and ors v Batchelor and ors appl of pltf from order of Mr Justice Parker, dated Feb 7, 1907 Feb 26

Beston v Watts appl of deft from order of Mr Justice Warrington, dated Feb 21, 1907 (produce order) Feb 26

Lloyds v The Marconi International Marine Communication Co Ltd and anr appl of defts from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Feb 15, 1907 (produce order) Feb 27

In re Meynell Ingram, dec Corry v Wood and ors appl of deft the Hon F G L Meynell from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Dec 4, 1906 March 1

Dibdin v Skirrow appl of pltf from order of Mr Justice Neville, dated Jan 24, 1907 March 1

Rees v Owen appl of defts from order of Mr Justice Warrington, dated Feb 9, 1907 (produce order) March 5

In re Davy, dec Hollingsworth v Davy and ors appl of defts from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated Jan 24, 1907 March 9

Brett (Widow) and ors v Tweedie and ors appl of pltf from order of Mr Justice Neville, dated Jan 30, 1907 March 13

In re Brinckman's Settled Estates and In re The Settled Land Acts, 1882 to 1900 appl of Sir T F Brinckman, Bart, from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated Feb 7, 1907 March 18

The Lincoln Equitable Co-operative Soc, Ltd v The Tannery, Lincoln, Co, Ltd appl of defts from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated Dec 13, 1907 March 19

In re Richard Miller's Will Jones and ors v Hawkins and anr appl of pltf from order of Mr Justice Swinfen Eady, dated Feb 27, 1907 March 19

In re Thomas Corbett, dec Viscount Cobham v The Attorney-General appl of deft from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Dec 4, 1906 March 20

Howatson v Webb Webb v Howatson and ors appl of deft Webb from order of Mr Justice Warrington, dated Feb 22, 1907 (produce order) March 21

Clark v Clark appl of pltf from order of Mr Justice Neville, dated March 4, 1907 (produce order) March 21

Woods v Weir appl of ptff from order of Mr Justice Warrington, dated March 7, 1907 (produce order) March 22
In the Matter of the Patents, Designs and Trade Marks Acts, 1883 to 1888, and in the Matter of Letters Patent, No. 1434* of the year 1899, granted to S G Brown appl of ptfrs from order of Mr Justice Neville, dated March 11, 1907 March 23
Draper v Lorden and H Sabey & Co appl of ptff from order of Mr Justice Warrington, dated Feb 18, 1907 (produce order) March 27
James v The Institute of Chartered Accountants appl of ptff from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Feb 1, 1907 March 27
In the Matter of the Kent Collieries Id Day v The Company and ors appl of ptff from order of Mr Justice Parker, dated March 22, 1907 (produce order) March 28
HM Postmaster-General v The National Telephone Co Id appl of defts from order of Mr Justice Swinfen Eady, dated March 20, 1907 (produce order) March 28

FROM THE CHANCERY DIVISION.

(Interlocutory List.)

1906.

In the Matter of the Co's Acts, 1862 to 1890 and in the Matter of Clinton's Gold Concessions Id (in liquidation) appl of E C Clinton from order of Mr Justice Buckley, dated July 31, 1906 (security ordered) Aug 13

1907.

Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik v George Elwin and Soc of Chemical Industry in Basle (Switzerland) appl of defts from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated Feb 27, 1907 March 4

Don Pablo de Montraval and ors v The East Argentine Ry Co Id and ors appl of ptffs from order of Mr Justice Neville, dated Feb 4, 1907 March 4

FROM THE PROBATE AND DIVORCE DIVISION.

(Final List.)

1906.

Probate Drake v Sykes appl of ptff from judgt of The President, dated July 26, 1906, jury discharged, Middlesex Oct 26

Divorce Francis Stewart Henry Todd (Petnr) v Charlotte Elizabeth Rose Francis Todd (Respt) William Cunniam (Co-Respt) appl of ptfrs from judgt of Mr Justice Bargrave Deane, dated Oct 26, 1906 Nov 1

1907.

Divorce Sarah Helen Ogden (Appl) v William Henry Ogden (Respt) appl of applt from judgt of Mr Justice Bargrave Deane, dated Dec 10, 1906 Feb 14

(New Trial Paper.)

1906.

Probate In re The Estate of John Hedley, dec William Wainwright and Edmund David White v John Herbert Hedley appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Bray, dated Aug 1, 1906, with a jury, Liverpool Nov 15

1907.

Divorce Bertha Ellen Reynolds (Petnr) v Frederick Reynolds (Respt) appl of Respt from judgt of Mr Justice Bargrave Deane, dated Feb 4, 1907 (security ordered) Feb 14

FROM THE COUNTY PALATINE COURT OF LANCASTER.

(Interlocutory List.)

1907.

Slack and ors v Calico Printers' Assoc Id appl of defts from order of the Vice-Chancellor of the County Palatine of Lancaster, dated Feb 11, 1907 (s o liberty to apply to restore) Feb 22

FROM THE KING'S BENCH DIVISION.

(In Bankruptcy.)

1907.

In re A Debtor (expte The Debtor), No 167 of 1907, from a Receiving Order made by Mr Registrar Hope on the 27th of Feb, 1907

In the F R Mayne (expte Dame Isabella Oxenden), No 393 of 1900 from an Order of Mr Justice Bigham, dated 3rd Dec, 1906 pt hd

In re W Round (expte P F Ward, Trustee) from an Order of the Divisional Court (Bigham and Darling, JJ), dated 27th Nov, 1906

In re Same (expte Same) from an Order of the Divisional Court (Bigham and Darling, JJ), dated 27th Nov, 1906

In re Same (expte Same) from an order of the Divisional Court (Bigham and Darling, JJ), dated 27th Nov, 1906

In re A Debtor (expte The Debtor), No 14 of 1907, from a Receiving Order made by Mr Registrar Giffard on 29th Jan 1907 pt hd

FROM THE KING'S BENCH DIVISION.

JUDGMENT RESERVED.

(In Appeal Court I.)

(Final List.)

The King v Local Government Board (expte Street) appl of J H Street from judgt of The Lord Chief Justice and Mr Justice Darling, dated Nov 15, 1906 (c a v March 22, 1907) (heard before The Master of the Rolls, Vaughan Williams and Buckley, LJJ.)

FROM THE KING'S BENCH DIVISION.

For Hearing.

(Final List.)

1905.

Rumball v Bunting appl of ptff from judgt of Mr Justice Channell,

dated March 11, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex (s o for appointment of legal representative) April 12

1906.

Smith and anr v Gobbels and ora (trading as Gobbel & Grandjean) appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Bigham, dated March 28, 1906, without a jury, Leeds (s o April 15, 1907) April 6

Frazer v Filer appl of ptff from judgt of the Lord Chief Justice and Justices Ridley and Darling, dated Feb 15, 1906 April 21

Lennard v Kent and East Sussex Light Ry Co appl of ptff from judgt of Mr Justice Ridley, dated Jan 31, 1906 (jury discharged), Middlesex (s o not before Aug 13, 1907) April 28

Mackay v Edwardes appl of ptff from judgt of Mr Justice Bigham, dated Jan 30, 1906, with a special jury, Middlesex April 30

The Queen of the River Steamship Co Id v The Conservators of the River Thames and Easton Gibb & Son appl of ptffs from judgt of Mr Justice Kennedy, dated March 23, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex May 7

Rex v The Mayor and Corp of Brighton (expte Edward Dudley Shoemsmith) appl of defts from judgt of the Lord Chief Justice and Justices Ridley and Darling, dated April 30, 1906 May 14

Green (Appl) v Assessment Committee of the Newport Union and Overseers of the Parish of Goldcliff (Respts) appl of appts from judgt of the Lord Chief Justice and Justices Ridley and Darling, dated April 26, 1906 May 16 Stead (Appl) v Assessment Committee of the Newport Union and the Overseers of the Parish of Nash (Respts) appl of appts from judgt of the Lord Chief Justice and Justices Ridley and Darling, dated April 26, 1906 May 16

Fitzgerald v Tiling appl of ptff from judgt of Mr Justice Jelf, dated May 9, 1906, with a common jury, Middlesex, and cross-notice by deft, dated June 1, 1906 May 17

In re an Arbnt between Cox, McEwen & Co and Hoare, Marr & Co and Arbn Act, 1889 appl of Cox, McEwen & Co from judgt of Mr Justice Bray, dated May 3, 1906 May 18

Hore v Day appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Buckley (additional judge), dated May 10, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex May 19

Taylor v Mayor, &c, of Maidenhed appl of ptff from judgt of Mr Justice Buckley (additional judge), dated May 12, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex May 21

De Jong v Johnson & Sons Id appl of ptff from judgt of Mr Justice Lawrence, dated Feb 24, 1906 May 22

The King v The Judge of the Marylebone County Court and The Great Western Ry appl of the Great Western Ry from judgt of the Lord Chief Justice and Justices Darling and Channell, dated May 9, 1906 May 22

Goldschmidt v Weldhen & Bleriot appl of ptff from judgt of Justices Kennedy and A T Lawrence, dated May 4, 1906 May 22

Housley and anr v Prosser appl of ptff from judgt of Mr Justice Walton, dated April 3, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex May 16

Smith v Prosser appl of ptff from judgt of Mr Justice Grantham, dated May 7, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex May 23

The King, on the prosecution of the Guardians, &c, of Walsall Union v Justices of Middlesex appl of Walsall Union from judgt of the Lord Chief Justice and Justices Darling and Channell, dated May 14, 1906 May 25

Beer v Bell (wife sued in respect of her separate estate) appl of ptff from judgt of Mr Justice A T Lawrence, dated May 19, 1906, with a special jury, Middlesex May 26

Richards v Hall appl of ptff from judgt of Justices Kennedy and A T Lawrence, dated May 17, 1906 May 26

In the Matter of the Arbitration Act, 1889 between Coleman's Depositories Id and The Life and Health Assce Assoc appl of Life and Health Assce Assoc Id from judgt of Mr Justice Bray, dated May 4, 1906 May 26

The King v City of London Union (expte Mayor, &c, of the City of London) appl of Associated Newspapers Id from judgt of the Lord Chief Justice and Mr Justice Bray, dated May 17, 1906 May 29 Same v Same appl of the Managers of the Metropolitan Asylum District from judgt of the Lord Chief Justice and Mr Justice Bray, dated May 17, 1906 (stay granted until hearing of appl) May 29

Hill v Thomas & Sons appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Sutton, dated April 11, 1906 May 29

Lancaster Rural District Council v Fisher & Le Fanu appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Bigham, dated May 16, 1906, without a jury, West Derby Division of the County of Lancaster May 16

Pacific Steam Navigation Co v Pugh & Son appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Bigham, dated May 15, 1906, without a jury, West Derby Division of the County of Lancaster, and cross-notice by ptffs, dated May 30, 1906 May 30

The King v City of London Union (ex parte Mayor, &c, of the City of London) appl of H R Barnes & Co Id from judgt of the Lord Chief Justice and Mr Justice Bray, dated May 17, 1906 May 31 Same v Same appl of Overseers of the Poor of the Precinct of Whitefriars from judgt from same Court, same date May 31 Same v Same appl of South-Eastern and Chatham Ry Companies Managing Committee from judgt from same Court, same date May 31

Wilkinson and anr v Lancashire and Yorkshire Ry Co appl of defts from judgt of Justices Kennedy and Bray, dated May 25, 1906 June 1

Lacons and ors v Warmoll appl of deft from judgt of Justices Kennedy and A T Lawrence, dated May 21, 1906 June 1

Clare v Joseph appl of ptff from judgment of Justices Ridley and Darling, dated May 23, 1906 June 2

Hewitt v Yiend and ors appl of ptff from judgt of Justices Ridley and Darling, dated May 21, 1906 June 6

- Harris v Fiat Motors Id appl of pltf from judge of Justices Ridley and Darling, dated May 17, 1906 (security ordered) June 7
- Phoenix Wharf and Coal Co Id v The Southampton Harbour Board appl of defts from judge of Mr Justice Bray, dated May 24, 1906 (special case) June 7
- Lane Bros v J Moralee, the younger (carrying on business as J Moralee & Co) appl of deft from judge of Mr Justice Sutton, dated May 21, 1906 without a jury, Middlesex June 7
- Young & Marten Id v Beach appl of deft from judge of Mr Justice Lawrence, dated May 19, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex June 8
- Lawton v Cameron appl of pltf from judge of the Hon Judge Taylor, KC, Court of Passage, Liverpool, dated May 28, 1906 June 11
- Oaborn v Cantlay and anr appl of pltf from judge of Justices Ridley and Darling, dated May 17, 1906 June 12
- Societe Francaise des Munitions, &c v Rabbidge appl of pltf from judge of Justices Kennedy and Bray, dated May 22, 1906 June 13
- In re Arbitration Act, 1889 Max Thomas and Holstrom & Co appl of Max Thomas from judge of Justices Ridley and Darling, dated May 21, 1906 June 13
- Buck v Broard and anr appl of pltf from judge of Mr Justice Ridley, dated May 30, 1906 June 13
- Mather v Hall & Co Id and Hall appl of pltf from judge of Mr Justice Phillimore, dated May 25, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex June 18
- Wheatley v Smithers and anr appl of pltf from judge of Justices Ridley and Darling, dated May 24, 1906 June 20
- English and Colonial Produce Co v Marchant appl of deft from judge of Mr Justice Kekewich (additional judge), dated June 8, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex June 28
- London and India Docks Co v Thames Steam Tug and Lighterage Co appl of pltf from judge of Justices Kennedy and A T Lawrence, dated June 12, 1906, and cross-notice by defts, dated July 21, 1906 June 30
- Evans v Hobbs appl of deft from judge of Mr Justice Kennedy, dated June 20, 1906, at Reading (Berks), common jury July 3
- Lancashire and Cheshire Coal Assoc and R Evans & Co Id v London and North-Western Ry Co and Lancashire and Yorkshire Ry Co (Railway and Canal Commission) appl of pltf from judge of Mr Justice Bigham, Sir F Peel, and The Hon A E Gathorne Hardy, dated June 21, 1906 July 3
- Oceanic Steam Ship Co v Faber appl of pltf from judge of Mr Justice Walton, dated May 1, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex July 4
- Lees v The Lancashire and Cheshire Miners Federation and ors appl of defts from judge of Mr Justice Ridley, dated June 19, 1906 (jury discharged) July 7
- London Salt Co Id v T S Harris & Co Id appl of pltf from judge of Mr Justice Bray, dated June 19, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex July 9
- Sharp v Bates appl of deft from judge of Justices Darling and Ridley, dated May 25, 1906 July 9
- Shaw v Spiers appl of pltf from judge of Mr Justice Swinfen Eady (additional judge), dated June 20, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex July 10
- In re Taxation of Costs and In re H R Newson, gentleman, &c appl of Newson from judge of Mr Justice Phillimore, dated June 21, 1906 (security ordered) July 12
- The Bede SS Co Id v The Bangan Syndikat G M B H of Berlin appl of defts from judge of Mr Justice Kennedy, dated June 23, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex July 14
- Automobile Review Id v Lamb Bros & Garnett appl of pltf from judge of Mr Justice Darling, dated June 1, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex July 16
- Horsley & Floyd v Edwards, Rumpler & Co and ors appl of defts Puddy & Hale Id from judge of Mr Justice Walton, dated May 21, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex July 24
- In the Matter of an Arbitration between W F B Eadon and the Lord Mayor, Aldermen and Burgesses of the City of Bristol appl of the Lord Mayor, &c, of Bristol from order of Mr Justice Kennedy, dated July 17, 1906 (special case) July 25 John Gibbs v Same July 25 Charles A Newman Same July 25 R H Carpenter and ors v Same July 25 (transferred to Final List, Aug 6, 1906)
- Grose-Smith v The Isle of Wight Ry Co appl of pltf from judge of Mr Justice Buckley (additional judge), dated May 5, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex July 26
- Manwaring v Jennings appl of deft from judge of Mr Justice Ridley, dated July 17, 1906 July 27
- In re The Agricultural Holdings Acts, 1883 to 1900, and In re an Arbitration between C E Jennings and E J Manwaring appl of C E Jennings from judge of His Honour Judge Emden (special case), dated July 13, 1906, Tunbridge Wells July 27
- 1906
- In re an Arbitration between Jennings and Manwaring appl of Jennings from judge of Justices Darling and Bray, dated Dec 20, 1906 Jan 7
- In re Arbitration Act, 1889 The Laundry Employers, &c, Co Id v The Accident Insce Co Id appl of Accident Insce Co from judge of Mr Justice Kennedy (special case), dated July 24, 1906 Aug 1
- Martyn v Cowell and anr appl of defts from judge of Mr Justice Phillimore, dated July 21, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex Aug 2
- The Premier Boiler Tubes Id v Hargreaves appl of deft from judge of Mr Justice Bray, dated July 20, 1906, without a jury, Manchester Aug 3
- The Mayor &c, of the Borough of chorley v Nightingale appl of pltf from judge of Justices Kennedy and A T Lawrence, dated July 19, 1906 Aug 3
- The Morrison Shipping Co Id v Drefus & Co appl of defts from judge of Mr Justice Phillimore, dated July 26, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex Aug 3
- Macbeth v The North and South Wales Bank Id appl of defts from judge of Mr Justice Bray, dated June 30, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex Aug 4
- Mayor, &c, of West Bromwich v Martin appl of deft from judge of Justices Kennedy and A T Lawrence, dated May 10, 1906 Aug 4
- Frost v Douglas appl of deft from judge of Mr Justice Ridley, dated July 31, 1906, Middlesex Aug 8
- Wilkinson v Walthamstow District Council and anr appl of pltf from judge of Justices Ridley and Darling, dated May 15, 1906 Aug 9
- Fear v Phillips appl of deft from judge of Mr Justice Jelf, dated July 30, 1906, without a jury, Cardiganshire Aug 10
- Attorney-General v London and India Docks Co (Revenue Side) appl of defts from judge of Mr Justice Walton, dated Aug 3, 1906 Aug 10
- Gent v Gent appl of pltf from judge of Mr Commissioner Pickford, KC, dated July 27, 1906, with a common jury, Durham Aug 11 Gent v Gent appl of deft from judge of Mr Commr Pickford, KC, and a common jury, Durham (advanced by order) Sept 6
- Attorney-General v The Great Northern, Piccadilly, and Brompton Ry (Revenue Side) appl of Attorney-General from judge of Mr Justice Walton, dated July 27, 1906 Aug 13
- Smith & Co v Traill appl of deft from judge of Justices Ridley and Darling, dated Aug 8, 1906 Aug 11
- Lewes Sanitary Steam Laundry Co Id v Barclay & Co appl of defts from judge of Mr Justice Kennedy, dated July 26, 1906, without a jury Aug 16
- Salt Union Id v Brunner, Mond, & Co Id appl of pltf from judge of The Lord Chief Justice, dated Aug 10, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex Aug 16
- Adams v The Marylebone Boro Council appl of pltf from judge of Justices Ridley and Darling, dated Aug 9, 1906 Aug 17
- Leadbitter and ors v Marylebone Boro Council appl of pltf from judge of Justices Ridley and Darling, dated Aug 9, 1906 Aug 17
- J M Irvine (trading, &c) v North and South Wales Bank Id appl of defts from judge of Mr Justice Bray, dated Aug 8, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex Aug 18
- Charles Wells v Tom Hughes (District Loan Co, clmcts) appl of pltf from judge of Justices Ridley and Darling, dated Aug 10, 1906 Aug 20
- Richardson and ors v Graham Id appl of defts from judge of Mr Commr Pickford, KC, dated Aug 3, 1906 (special jury), Durham Aug 20
- J Altman v The Drovers' Benevolent Institution appl of defts from judge of Mr Justice Bray, dated Aug 10, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex Aug 21
- W H Stott & Co Id v A E White & Co appl of defts from judge of The Hon Judge Taylor, KC, Court of Passage, Liverpool, dated Aug 10, 1906 Aug 21
- Morten & Paterson and anr v Dyson, Smith & Marchant appl of defts from judge of Justices Ridley and Darling, dated Aug 10, 1906 Aug 25
- The Pretoria Pietersburg Ry Co Id v Eliasha Elwood (Surveyor of Taxes) and Eliasha Elwood v The Pretoria Pietersburg Ry Co Id (Revenue Side) appl of pltf Co from order of Mr Justice Walton, dated Aug 10, 1906 Aug 29
- McDougall & Bouthron Id v London and India Docks Co appl of defts from judge of Mr Justice Walton, dated Aug 11, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex, and cross notice by pltf, dated Oct 24, 1906 Aug 30
- Page, Son & East Id v London and India Docks Co appl of defts from judge of Mr Justice Walton, dated Aug 11, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex, and cross notice by pltf, dated Oct 14, 1906 Aug 30
- J N Lister v R Hooson appl of pltf from judge of Mr Justice Grantham, dated July 25, 1906, without a jury, Yorkshire, WR Aug 31
- The Gramophone and Typewriter Id v Josiah Walter Stanley, Surveyor of Taxes (Revenue Side) appl of respt from order of Mr Justice Walton, dated Aug 10, 1906 Sept 3
- Gingell, Son & Foakett Id v The Stepney Borough Council appl of defts from judge of Mr Justice Swinfen Eady (additional judge), dated July 10, 1906 Sept 13
- De Beauvais v Green appl of deft from judge of Mr Justice Lawrence dated July 6, 1905 Oct 8
- Austin v Woodman appl of deft from judge of Mr Justice Grantham, dated Aug 9, 1906, non-jury, Leeds Oct 22
- Woolnough v Dunk appl of deft from judge of Justices Ridley and Darling, dated Aug 10, 1906 Oct 29
- Pymant v Marten appl of pltf from judge of Mr Justice Phillimore, dated Aug 10, 1906 (Commercial List), Middlesex Nov 1
- Waddle (Appl) v Guardians of Sunderland Poor Law Union (Respts) appl of pltf from judge of The Lord Chief Justice and Justices Ridley and Darling, dated Oct 26, 1906 Nov 8
- Herbert Morris & Bairstow Id v Mayor, &c of the Borough of Loughborough appl of pltf from judge of Mr Justice Bigham, dated Oct 26, 1906 Nov 8
- Cardiff Union and ors (Appls) v Taff Vale Ry Co (Respts) appl of appts from judge of Mr Justice Bigham, dated July 6, 1906 Nov 12
- Edmund and ors v Martell (Spinster) appl of deft from judge of Mr Justice Sutton, dated Oct 31, 1906, and cross-notice by pltf, dated Dec 13, 1906 Nov 12
- The King v The Justices of Southampton (expte Thoyle & Bryans) appl of Thoyle & Bryans from judge of The Lord Chief Justice and Justices Ridley and Darling, dated Oct 29, 1906 Nov 13
- Manfield and ors v Reef appl of deft from judge of the Lord Chief Justice, dated Aug 9, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex Nov 13
- Page v Howell appl of deft from judge of the Lord Chief Justice and Mr Justice Darling, dated Nov 14, 1906 Nov 17
- Winstanley (Appl) v Overseers of the Poor of the Township of North

Manchester (Respts) appl of respts from judgt of The Lord Chief Justice and Justices Ridley and Darling, dated Nov 5, 1906 Nov 19
 Royal Bank of Canada v Powell Bros & Co appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Grantham, dated Nov 7, 1906, jury discharged, Middlesex Nov 20
 Jonas (Applt) v The Churchwardens and Overseers of the Parish of St Dunstan's in the West (Respts) appl of applt from judgt of The Lord Chief Justice and Justices Ridley and Darling, dated Oct 27, 1906 Nov 20
 Douglas (Applt) v Smith (Respt) appl of applt from judgt of The Lord Chief Justice and Justices Ridley and Darling, dated Nov 7, 1906 Nov 20
 In the Matter of G J Vanderpump, a solr, and In the Matter of the Solicitors Act, 1888 appl of G J Vanderpump from judgt of The Lord Chief Justice and Justices Ridley and Darling, dated Nov 7, 1906 Nov 21
 Couchman and anr (Appts) v Lewisham Borough Council (Respts) appl of applets from judgt of The Lord Chief Justice and Justices Ridley and Darling, dated Oct 30, 1906 Nov 22
 In the Matter of the Arbitration Act, 1889, and in the Matter of an Arbitration between Horton (Clmt) and the Colwyn Bay and Colwyn Urban District Council (Respts) appl of clmt from judgt of Mr Justice Bigham on special case, dated Nov 13, 1906 Nov 26
 Prior v Johanning & Co appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated Nov 2, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex Nov 27
 Isaac v Burnard appl of ptff from judgt of Mr Justice Darling, dated Nov 17, 1906, Middlesex Nov 28
 McDiarmid v Kolkemann & Co appl of ptff from judgt of Mr Justice Darling, dated Nov 23, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex Nov 30
 Western Wagon and Property Co ld v Wilmshurst and ors appl of defts Wilmshurst and Chandler from judgt of Mr Justice Bigham, dated Nov 20, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex Dec 3
 In the Matter of John Morris and ors, Solrs, &c appl of Wyler from judgt of Mr Justice Bucknill, dated Nov 27, 1906 Dec 11
 Grace (trading as H & E Lea) v Farmer & Sons appl of ptff from judgt of Mr Justice Bucknill, dated Nov 28, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex Dec 13
 The King v The Comrns of Inland Revenue (expte Sylvester) appl of Silvester from judgt of The Lord Chief Justice and Mr Justice Darling, dated Nov 15, 1906 Dec 14
 Emanuel and ors v Lymon appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated Nov 26, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex Dec 15
 Smith & Co ld v Marshall and anr appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice A T Lawrence, dated Dec 6, 1906, jury discharged, West Division, County of Lancaster Dec 20
 Macbeth & Co ld v The Maritime Inscce Co ld appl of ptiffs from judgt of Mr Justice Walton, dated Nov 12, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex Dec 24
 New Zealand Shipping Co v Stephens (Surveyor of Taxes) (Revenue Side) appl of applets from judgt of Mr Justice Bray, dated Dec 10, 1906 Dec 31
 In the Matter of an Arbtm between The Great Eastern Ry Co and The London County Council appl of The London Council from judgt of Mr Justice Kennedy, dated Dec 12, 1906 Dec 28
 Greenshields, Cowie & Co v Thomas Stephens & Sons ld appl of ptiffs from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated Dec 19, 1906 (Commercial List), Middlesex Dec 28
 Oppenheimer v Attenborough appl of ptff from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated Dec 11, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex Dec 31

1907.

United States Shipping Co v Empress Asse Corpns appl of ptiffs from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated Dec 5, 1906 (Commercial List), Middlesex Jan 1
 Byrne v Judge and ors appl of ptff from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated Nov 17, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex Jan 9
 The Leonis SS Co ld v Joseph Rank ld appl of ptiffs from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated Dec 17, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex Jan 10
 Swan (Trustee) and ors v The Maritime Inscce Co ld and anr appl of deft Maritime Inscce Co from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated Nov 28, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex Jan 10
 Alston and ors v Mineard appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Darling, dated Dec 15, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex Jan 10
 Adams v Matthews and Bellord appl of deft Bellord from judgt of Mr Justice Jelf, dated Dec 20, 1906, Middlesex Jan 14
 Reeves v Hutchinson appl of ptff from judgt of Mr Justice Grantham, dated Oct 27, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex Jan 21
 A B Cooper (Surveyor of Taxes) v The Rev Douglas Yeoman Blakiston appl of applt from judgt of Mr Justice Bray, dated Jan 11, 1907 Jan 18
 Dewar v Goodman appl of ptff from judgt of Mr Justice Jelf, dated Jan 11, 1907, without a jury, Middlesex Jan 23
 Howard v Harrington appl of ptff from judgt of Justices Darling and Phillipmore, dated Jan 15, 1907 Jan 23
 Coles and ors v Myers appl of ptiffs from judgt of Mr Justice Jelf, dated Jan 14, 1907, without a jury, Middlesex Jan 28
 Hammerley-Kennedy & Co v Smith appl of ptiffs from judgt of Justices Darling and Phillipmore, dated Jan 17, 1907 Jan 28
 Turville v The Blaina Colliery Co ld appl of ptff from judgt of Mr Justice Sutton, dated Jan 29, 1907, without a jury, Swansea Jan 29
 Nelson & Sons ld v Nelson Line (Liverpool) appl of ptiffs from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated Jan 15, 1907, Middlesex Jan 30

(To be continued.)

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

CHANCERY DIVISION.

EASTER Sittings, 1907.

NOTICES RELATING TO THE CHANCERY CAUSE LIST.

Motions, Petitions, and Short Causes will be taken on the days stated in the Easter Sittings Paper.

Mr. Justice KEKEWICH will take his business as announced in the Easter Sittings Paper.

Mr. Justice JOYCE.—Except when other business is announced in the Daily Cause List, Mr. Justice Joyce will take Actions with Witnesses daily throughout the Sittings.

Mr. Justice SWINFEN EADY.—Except when other business is advertised in the Daily Cause List, Mr. Justice Swinfen Eady will take Actions with Witnesses daily throughout the Sittings.

Mr. Justice WARRINGTON will take his business as announced in the Easter Sittings Paper.

Mr. Justice NEVILLE will take his business as announced in the Easter Sittings Paper.

Liverpool and Manchester Business.—Mr. Justice NEVILLE will take Liverpool and Manchester business as follows: Summonses in Chambers, Motions, Short Causes, Petitions and Adjourned Summonses on Saturdays the 13th and 27th April, and the 11th May.

Mr. Justice PARKER.—Except when other business is advertised in the Daily Cause List Mr. Justice Parker take Actions with Witnesses daily throughout the Sittings.

Summonses before the Judge in Chambers.—Mr. Justice KEKEWICH, Mr. Justice WARRINGTON, and Mr. Justice NEVILLE will sit in court every Monday during the sittings to hear Chamber Summonses.

Summonses Adjourned into Court will be taken as follows: Mr. Justice KEKEWICH, as stated in the Sittings Paper; Mr. Justice WARRINGTON, with Non-Witness Actions; and Mr. Justice NEVILLE, with Non-Witness Actions.

SPECIAL NOTICE WITH REFERENCE TO THE CHANCERY WITNESS LISTS.

During the Easter Sittings the judges will sit for the disposal of Witness Actions as follows:

Mr. Justice JOYCE will take the Witness List for KEKEWICH and JOYCE, JJ.

Mr. Justice SWINFEN EADY will take the Witness List for SWINFEN EADY and NEVILLE, JJ.

Mr. Justice PARKER will take the Witness List for WARRINGTON and PARKER, JJ.

Chancery Causes for Trial or Hearing.

(Set down to March 28th, 1907.)

Before Mr. Justice KEKEWICH.
Retained.

Causes for trial (with witnesses).

The Ideal Bedding Co ld v Holland act and m f j pt hd

In re Sykes, dec Jaram v Holmes act pt hd

Ball v Friend act

In re A P Earle, dec In re N Earle, dec Abernethy v Earle act

Causes for Trial (without Witnesses).

Beecham v Lastingham and Rose-dale Light Ry m f j

In re Halliwell & Co ld Hupfeld v The Company m f j

Green v Clarke act

Hannaford v Huggins act

Whitmore-Searle v Whitmore-Searle act

Adjourned Summonses.

In re Hawkesley Walker v Hill adjd sumns

In re McKay Herford v McKay two adjd sumns

In re Parsons Parsons v Parsons adjd sumns

In re Pardoe McLaughlin v Powell adjd sumns

In re Coulson, dec Wray v Coulson adjd sumns

In re Harris, dec Paul v Le Merchant adjd sumns

Meters ld v Met Gas Meters ld adjd sumns

Goward v McLeay adjd sumns

In re Hicken, dec Wilkins v Garner adjd sumns (restored)

In re Lewis Hill Davies v Lewis Hill adjd sumns

In re Raby Millar v Hall adjd sumns

In re Stanbury Stanbury v Brook adjd sumns

In re Puckering Puckering v Bruce adjd sumns

In re Coote Coote v Coote adjd sumns

In re Fellows Fellows v Banks adjd sumns

In re T Watkins & Co ld Thomas v The Company adjd sumns

In re William Thomas, dec Hansard v Thomas adjd sumns

Marrian's Trustee v Swann adjd sumns

In re Saul Norrie v Saul adjd sumns

In re Salaman De Pass v Sonnenthal adjd sumns

In re MacLean's Settlement In re Maclean, dec Clark v Maclean adjd sumns

In re Joseph Joseph v Frank adjd sumns

In re Openshaw Purnell v Purnell adjd sumns

In re Watts, dec Barker v Tillyard adjd sumns

In re Ouvry, dec Farrer v Thomson adjd sumns

Taylor v Champness adjd sumns

In re Abbott Abbott v Abbott adjd sumns

In re Betts Doughty v Walker adjd sumns

In re Handley, dec Wildsmith v Hobson adjd sumns

Strickland v Sicock adjd sumns

Before Mr Justice JOYCE.
Retained Business.

In re Mordan Legg v Mordan adjd sumns

Major, &c, of Portsmouth v Hall adjd sumns

Major, &c, of Bournemouth v Poole and District Electric Traction Co ld fur con

Ca
Sm
ad
Can
to
In
27
D
m
on
Ja
Har
Hug
Lew
be
Hol
cla
Rein
tra
Coate
Es
In re
act
Gre
cla
Hod
Hoos
Lond
v
Power
Amas
Ap
Mann
Powe
clai
Samu
Hone
Dixon
Jennin
act
Inre
The
Mar
Inre
act
act
In re
act
Tracey
Thomp
Meters
ld
The
Dou
Harry
John
Sout
Innes
10)
Tayl
Tract

Before

Kaplan
The M
Smith
Staunto
(Elect

Ad
In re W
Gen
Inre Ma
adjd s

Causes
Steers v
Montgo
claim
Cropper
counte
Trustees
Higgin
In re Ba
Ballin
Williams
Notaras v
claim (n
Pite v Ba
claim (n

Causes for Trial (with Witnesses).
 Smith v Law Guarantee Trust Soc act
 Cammell, Laird & Co Id v Harrington Harbour and Dock Board act
 In re Walohn's Trade Mark, No 272,419 and In re The Patents, Designs and Trade Marks Act, 1905 motion to rectify register (to come on with trial of act, Rosenthal v Janowitz, not yet set down)
 Harlech v Huntly act
 Huggins v Bateman act
 Lewis v Huggins & Co act (not before April 15)
 Holmes v Bell act and counter-claim
 Reiner v Motor Trading and Contract Corps Id act
 Coates v Henderson's Transvaal Estates Id act
 In re Reid, dec Abraham v Reid act
 Greenfield v Lund act and counter-claim
 Hodson v Thétard act
 Hossack v Gifford act
 London and Westminster Bank Id v Kinnaird act
 Powell v Browne act
 Amasia Id v Fraser act (not before April 22)
 Mann v Mann act
 Powell v Bloomer act and counter-claim
 Samuel v Samuel act
 Hone v Corps of Cheltenham act
 Dixon v Ward act
 Jennings v Haling Down Estate Id act
 In re Hudson's Application and In re The Patents, Designs and Trade Marks Acts, 1905 motion
 In re Robinson Clayton v Robinson act
 In re Eliza Cowan Cowan v Edell act
 Tracey-Elliott v Earl of Morley act
 Thompson v Cain act
 Meters Id v Metropolitan Gas Meters Id motion
 The Fine Cotton Spinners' and Doublers' Assoc Id and anr v Harwood, Cash & Co Id act
 John Myers & Co Id v London and South-Western Ry Co act
 Innes v Auld act (not before May 10)
 Tayleur v The Dolter Electric Traction Id act

Before Mr. Justice SWINFEN EADY.
 Retained by Order.
 Motions.
 Kaplan v Goldsoll
 The Mutual Loan Fund Assoc v Smith
 Staunton v Hampshire Light Ry (Electric) Co.

Adjudged Summons.
 In re Walker, dec King v Attorney Gen adjd sumns
 In re Macomie Macomie v Macomie adjd sumns

Causes for Trial (with Witnesses).
 Steers v Willis act
 Montgomery v Wilkins counter-claim
 Cropper v Margetson act and counter-claim
 Trustees of Flower, a Bankrupt v Higgins act
 In re Ballinger, dec Tomkins v Ballinger act (not before May 6)
 Williamson v Dunbar act and counter-claim
 Notaras v Notaras' act and counter-claim (s o)
 Pite v Balfour act and counter-claim (not before April 30)

Decies v Beresford act (s o)
 Barrs v Wilkinson act
 The Trustees of the Property of H E Bond, a Bankrupt v H E Bond & Co Id act
 Spottiswoode v Brittan act
 Freeth v Kent County Gas Light and Coke Co act
 Hardy v National Standard Life Assurance Corp Id act (without pleadings) (not before April 10)
 In re Thomas Williams, dec Tatem v Hurman act
 C Phillipsbourne Id v Hawes act
 Lancaster Banking Co v Carey act and counter-claim
 Bagot v Chapman act and m f j (not before April 22)
 Ferris v Northampton act
 In re Blogg's Brewery Id Pearson v The Company act
 Lundy v Mitchell act
 King v Gray act
 Jefferson Dodd Id v Dodd's Drug Stores Id act
 In re Brown, dec Brown v Brown act
 Richards v Thomas act
 Duke of Northumberland v Blaydon District Industrial and Provident Soc act (not before April 15)
 Macdougall v British and Colonial Estates act
 Cree v Stone act and counterclaim
 Pawson & Brailsford v Hides & Speirs act
 Dickson v Story act
 Tredwen v Bucknell act and counter-claim
 London and County Banking Co v Barrs act
 Pilcher v Burch act
 White, Tomkins, & Courage Id v Wilson act
 National Standard Life Assurance Corp Id v Cook act and counter-claim
 Kenilworth Court Id v Burn act
 In re Ballam, dec Ballam v Ballam act
 Schwerdt v Bulpett act
 Wombwell Urban District Council v Dearne Valley Waterworks act
 Higgs' Dairy Farms Id v Powell act
 Taff Vale Ry v Cardiff Gas Light and Coke Co act
 Pauls v Hurstleigh Id act
 Selwyn v Meyer act and m f j
 In re Fowler, dec Fowler v Shufeldt act
 In re Lufkin Lufkin v Lufkin act and counter-claim
 Pickles v Myers act and m f j
 Varley v Simpson act
 Reckitt & Sons Id v Hertz & Co act
 Leete v Howell J Williams Id act and counter-claim
 Mayor, &c., of West Hartlepool v Thompson act
 In re Trade Marks Act, 1905, and In re Springfield Chemical Co and In re Cadbury Packing Co motion
 Ireland v Etheridge act
 Seaton Chisholm v Fowler act
 Lewis v Morse act
 Parr v Roberts act
 Andrews v Waite act
 Heenan v Jones act
 Wood v Rawle act
 R Hornsby & Sons Id v Babcock & Wilcox Id act and counter-claim
 Wilmot v London Mineral Waters Id act and counter-claim
 Hobbs v Stephenson act and counter-claim
 Lennane v Lennane act and counter-claim
 Salmon v Norman act
 In re David Gestetner's Trade Mark, No 37,760 and In re The Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Act, 1905 motion
 Nugent v Nugent Nugent v Nugent

Nugent v Nugent Wallaseek v Nugent acts
 The Crystal Palace Co v Soc of Motor Manufacturers and Traders Id act
 Wallington v Butcher act
 Lord Howard de Walden v Eastes act

Before Mr. Justice WARRINGTON.
 Retained by Order.
 Short Cause.
 Howatson v Webb Webb v Howatson and ors m f j

Adjourned Summons.
 In re Coventry's Trusts Meredith v Coventry adjd sumns pt hd (s o)

Causes for Trial (with Witnesses).
 Thermit Id v Weldite Id act pt hd (fixed for April 17, subject to anything pt hd)
 Müller v Müller and ors act (fixed for April 10, subject to anything pt hd)
 Holsworthy Urban District Council v The Rural District Council of Holsworthy act
 In re Bruce, dec Heathorn v Bruce act
 The Ironmongers, &c v The London County Council act
 Chivers v Ayris act
 The Attorney-General on the relation Rural District Council of Hambleton v Friary Holroyd & Healey's Breweries Id act
 Rimington v Seal act (without pleadings) pt hd (s o)
 Jones v Thomas act pt hd

Causes for Trial without Witnesses and Adjourned Summons.
 In re Charlesworth, dec Scott v Herrnhut adjd sumns (s o)

In re De la Hoyde's Estate De la Hoyde v De la Hoyde adjd sumns (s o April 10)

Peakhill Goldfield, Id v Simpson adjd sumns pt hd (s o)

In re Ingram, dec Ingram v Ingram adjd sumns pt hd (s o liberty to apply to restore)

In re Hazeldine's Trusts and In re The Trustee Act, 1893 adjd sumns

In re W Mussel, dec Kocynski v Wardle adjd sumns

Moon v Holmes adjd sumns

In re William Morson, dec Walton v Morson adjd sumns

In re A Little, dec Little v Little adjd sumns

In re Elizabeth Ransom, dec Smith v Ransom adjd sumns

In the Matter of Lord Stamford's Cheshire Estates and In re The Settled Land Acts adjd sumns

In re Searle, dec Searle v Searle adjd sumns (s o liberty to apply to restore)

In re The Estate of George Heaven, dec Heaven v Heaven adjd sumns

In re Nathan, dec Herring v Spyre adjd sumns

Sapio v Hackney adjd sumns

In re Tuck, dec Murch v Loosemore adjd sumns

In the Matter of the Estate of M. Salaman, dec Blaikley v Salaman adjd sumns

In re Adams' Trustees and Frost's Contract and Vendor and Purchaser Act, 1874 adjd sumns

In re John Baber, dec Baber v Mimpriss adjd sumns

Buxton and anr v Roscoe and anr m f j

In re J H Morten, dec Aldridge v Morten adjd sumns

In re William Peters, dec Peters v Peters adjd sumns
 In re Thomas Lewis, dec Griffiths v Rees adjd sumns
 In re Baroness Currie, dec Harbord v Baroness de Groote adjd sumns Stockdale v Carbonneau and Penn-Wyoming Copper Co adjd sumns In re Thomas Brandreth, dec Brandreth v Johnson adjd sumns In re The Liskeard and Looe Ry Co Spicer v The Company and anr act

Companies (Winding-up) and Chancery Division.
 Companies (Winding-up). Petitions.

Thomas Salt & Co Id (petn of C H Watson—s o from Oct 30, 1906, to come on with a petition to sanction a scheme of arrangement)

Steel Core Concrete Co Id (petn of T A Richardson—s o from Jan 22, to 2nd petition day in July)

Mayhew Compo-Board Co Id (petn of Ekman & Co—s o from March 5 to April 16)

Tin Prospectors Syndicate Id (petn of Treffry, Clunes & Co—s o from March 12 to April 23)

Motor Omnibus Construction Co Id (petn of Coventry Plating and Presswork Co Id—s o from March 14 to a day to be fixed in Easter Sittings—retained by Mr Justice Parker)

London Cosmopolitan Club Syndicate Id (petn of A L Clarke & Co Id—s o from March 19 to April 16)

Maisel Brothers & Co Id (petn of African Merchants Id—s o from March 26 to April 23)

Kent's Flooring Syndicate Id (petn of F C Byrne—s o from March 26 to April 16)

Consolidated Mines Id (petn of D Cairney)

Improved Electric Supplies Id (petn of Krupka & Jacoby)

British Electric Equipment Co Id (petn of Improved Wood Pavement Co Id)

Dartford Portland Cement Co Id (petn of John Waddell & Sons)

Highgate Hill Tramways Id (petn of Rickett, Cockerell & Co Id)

Chancery Division.
 Petitions (to Confirm Reduction of Capital) under Companies Acts, 1867 and 1877.

West of England Paper Staining Co Id and reduced

Robert Williams & Sons Id and reduced

Petition under Companies (Memorandum of Association) Act, 1890. United Counties Bank Id

Action for Trial.
 Short Cause.
 Yolland, Husson & Birkett Id Leicester v Yolland, Husson & Birkett Id and anr (m f j—s o from March 26 with liberty to restore)

Companies (Winding up). Motions.

Mayfair Printing and Publishing Co Id (for leave to issue writ of attachment—ordered to stand over generally on April 3, 1906)

Colossal Cycle and Component Manufacturing Corp Id (for leave to issue writ of attachment—s o from Dec 18, 1906, to April 16, 1907)

Court Summons.

Syria Ottoman Railway Co Ltd (as to proofs of debt of W Parker—ordered to s o on Jan 11, 1906, to be tried with certain actions)

City and Suburban Motor Omnibus Co Ltd (on Peter Union Tyre Co's claim—with witnesses—part heard—s o from March 26 to a day to be fixed—retained by Mr Justice Parker)

Same (for leave to adduce oral evidence—s o from March 26 to a day to be fixed—retained by Mr Justice Parker)

Dover Coalfields Extension Ltd (misfeasance—with witnesses)

Tabor, Trego & Co Ltd (on J Sadler's claim)

Before Mr. Justice NEVILLE.

Retained by Order.

Witness Actions.

Smoothy v Schmidt act and counter-claim

Harris & Co v Hardyman & Lowe act

Miller v Wardle act

Further Consideration.

In re F J Clarke, dec Brown v Clarke fur con

Causes for Trial without Witnesses and Adjudged Summons.

In re Ballard Macdonald v Harding adjd sumns

In re Ward, dec Ford v Burns adjd sumns (restored)

In re Cornish Hedges v Cornish adjd sumns

In re Franklin, dec Pearce v Cossens adjd sumns (restored)

In re Twining Tweed v Twining adjd sumns

In re Isaacs Isaacs v Stansfeld adjd sumns

In re Harvey, dec Rowsell v Ravenhill adjd sumns

Bolton v Wintle act

In re Bigge Granville v Moore adjd sumns

In re the Rules of the Supreme Court, 1883 and In re the Application of W Bryant adjd sumns

In re Roberts, dec Roberts v Pritchard adjd sumns

In re Dolman Mackenzie v Dolman adjd sumns

In re Cook, dec In re Penny, dec Evans v Holmes adjd sumns

In re Wheater In re Stones Carr v Stones adjd sumns

In re Hulme Grammar School Charity Board of Education v Yates adjd sumns

In re Gibb Times v Gibb adjd sumns

Before Mr. Justice PARKER.

Retained by Order.

Further Consideration, &c.

In re The Farncombe Paper Co Ltd Combe v The Company fur con and four adjd sumns

In re Same Same v Same (by order)

Short Cause.

Breckles and anr v King and ors m f j (a generally)

Petition.

In re A & F Pears ld and reduced (s o)

Causes for Trial (with Witnesses.)

In re Letters Patent, No 14,006 of 1903, granted to J N Alsop and In re The Patents, &c. Acts petn for revocation (s o until after Comptroller's decision)

A E Potter & Co v Kent Coal Concessions ld and anr act pt hd (a o) The Sondage Syndicate v A E Potter & Co act

Doyne v Pennell Doyne v Pennell and anr acts consolidated

In the Matter of the Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Acts, 1883 to 1888, and In the Matter, &c S Courtauld & Co ld v Max Muller petn for revocation (fixed for 1st day Easter Sittings)

Evans v Bryan Works ld act

Lipman v Sibley act

Godden v The Kent County Gas Light, &c, Co act (s o)

Rimington v Seal act (without pleadings) (s o)

Jones v Thomas act (s o)

Porteaus v Mason original act Mason v Porteaus by counter-claim

Pool and ors v Mauzell act

Von Bursian v Dobson act

In re Margaret Richards, dec Dowdeswell v Bartlett act

In re Horsfall's Settlement Horsfall v Wilson act

A J Pearlman (married woman) v J Foster (widow) act

Boston v Boston act

Garrard v Campbell act

In the Matter of a Deed of Arrangement Atkinson Clinton & Clintons ld act

Andrewes v The International Tea Co's Stores ld act

Poole v Francis act

Iron Ox Remedy Co Ltd v Co-operative Wholesale Soc ld act Iron Ox Remedy Co Ltd v Leeds Industrial Co-operative Soc ld act

Anderson and Wife v Sword act

Rout v Bowen act

Calstock Rural District Council v The British Mining and Metal Co ld act

Stockdale & Parker v Carboneau and The Penn-Wyoming Copper Co act

Tolson v W James & Sons ld act

Mourilyan v Burrell act

Griffiths v Williams act

Bate v Read act

Reversionary Interest Soc ld v Blake and ors act

Doland v Raiken act

Wards v The Dartford Brewery Co ld act

Mitchell and anr v Hutchings and anr act

Forbes v Forbes act

Walker v Linom and ors act and m f j against ors

Winterflood v Ewart & Son ld act

Goodwin v Carl act

Warrington, the elder v E

Warrington and ors act

Pye v Likely Royal Exchange Assce Corp and anr v Pye and ors act

and m f j against ors

Creditors' Notices.
Under Estates in Chancery.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, April 5.

BRIGGS, EMMA, Elm Lodge, Putney Common May 6 Penfold v Briggs, Parker, J Burton, Watling st

PENDER, CHARLES, Cheetham, Manchester, Skip Maker May 4 Pender v Pender, Registrar, Manchester Cunningham, Manchester

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, April 9.

BUTLER, SAMUEL, Westbury on Trym, or Bristol, Director of Companies May 6 Butler v Butler, Parker, J Morgan, Cardiff

Under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, March 29.

ADAMS, MARY ELIZABETH, New Barnet April 30 Hawke, Martin's Inn

BACKHOUSE, KATHARINA, Ashburn, Sunderland April 29 Kidson & Co, Sunderland

BELSHAM, SARAH ANN, Cuckooe, Norfolk May 1 Vores, East Dereham

BOSTOCK, EMMA SOPHIA, Cheltenham May 1 Churchman & Co, Mincing in

BOYNTON, CHARLES, Croydon April 30 Van Sandau & Co, King st, Cheapside

BRADFIELD, HANNAH, Lwesfield May 1 Vores, East Dereham

BRIDGE, HENRY CHARLES, Folkestone May 30 Bircham & Co, Old Broad st

BROWN, ANNE MARIA, Blackheath May 1 Graham & Co, Edinburgh

CROOKES, SARAH ANN, Bridgwater April 30 Jones, Stansgate

DOUGLAS, GEORGINA AUGUSTA, Porchester sq, Paddington May 31 Budd & Co, Bedford town

DUDIN, JOHN BOWELL, Southwark, Hants May 1 Parker & Hollis, Finsbury sq

DURDAN, THE HON. OSBURNTHORPE THOMAS, Northallerton, Yorks April 29 Frere & Co, Lincoln's inn fields

EDWARDS, JOHN ALLEN, Croydon May 7 Edell & Gordon, King st, Cheapside

ELLIOT, THOMAS ANDREW, Caoriton on Medlock, Manchester, Master Plumber April 15 Gouly & Goodfellow, Manchester

EVANS, JAMES EDWARD, Clifton April 25 Bush & Bush, Bristol

FOX, J. B., Daventry rd, Holloway April 26 Leggatts & Carruthers, Raymond, bldg, Gray's inn

GOODFELLOW, WILLIAM, Birmingham, Licensed Victualler May 10 James & Co, Birmingham

GOODRICK, JOHN, HARROGATE, Farmer May 1 Gillings & Son, Harrogate

GRIMTHORPE, THE RIGHT HON. EDMUND BARON, ST ALBANS May 31 Beal, Queen st, Cheapside

HAMILTON, WILLIAM DES VONDX, Rownhams, Southampton May 1 Cope & Co, Victoria st, Westminster

HANCOCK, SARAH SOUTAIN, Bath May 11 Simmons & Co, Bath

HARRIS, FRANCES, Blackpool May 1 Procter & Son, Burnley

HART, ISAAC, King's Caple, Hereford, Farmer May 15 Humphrys & Symonds, Hereford

HUGHES, HENRY, Bristol April 28 Stevens, Bristol

ISAACS, MYRA LEWIS, Sutherland sq, Maid's Vale May 8 Long & Gardiner, Lincoln's inn fields

JOHNSON, MORIS, Queen Elizabeth st, Tower Bridge April 27 Colyer & Colyer, Clement's inn, Strand

KEARSLY, PETER, Leigh, Lancs April 25 Docton, Leigh, Lancs

KITCHIN, ELLES MINTY, Glenlucie rd, Westcombe Park May 10 Worrell & Son, Coleman st

LLOYD, TOM STEEDMAN, Weston Super Mare, Civil Engineer May 1 Smith & Sons, Weston Super Mare

MARSH, HENRY, Thorganby, Lincs May 21 Barton, Tunbridge Wells

MASTERS, CHARLES AUGUSTUS, Stratford April 30 Pedley & Co, Bush ln

METCALFE, JOHN HENRY, Northallerton, Yorks April 29 Vaughan, Middleham, S O, Yorks

NEWTON, WILLIAM GEORGE May 14 Vanderpump, Enfield Town

NUTTING, MARY JANE, Beauvale House, nr Warwick May 31 Surman & Quirk,

Lincoln's inn fields

RAMSDALE, ELIZABETH, Cardiff April 30 Hughes, Barry

RAMSDALE, JOSEPH, Cardiff April 30 Hughes, Barry

RAWNSLEY, MADELINE, Hastings April 23 Bartlett & Gregory, New sq, Lincoln's inn

RICHARDSON, ANN, Ashville Crossroads, Yorks April 17 Falsethorpe & Thorpe, Leeds

ROBINS, MATTHEW THOMAS, Walbrook, Paper Merchant May 8 Piess & Sons, Old Jewry chambers

SCOTT, AARON, Grange over Sands, Lancs, Farmer April 30 Townsend, Barrow in Furness

SHAKESPEARE, JOHN OSIRIMUS, Liverpool, Licensed Victualler April 23 Parkison, Liverpool

SIBETH, WERNER EDMUND, Raynes Park, Wimbledon April 27 Blount & Co, Albemarle st

SMITH, WILLIAM HENRY, Windhill, nr Shipley, Tea Merchant May 6 Freeman, Radford

SPOONER, THOMAS, Tachbrook st, Pimlico April 25 Bartlett & Gregory, New sq, Lincoln's inn

TAYLOR, MARTHA, Thorne Vicarage, nr Wakefield, Housekeeper May 1 Kay, York

TYSON, MILDRED, Grimsby April 26 Wilkin & Chapman, Gt Grimsby

WAKEFIELD, ALICIA, Manfield, Notts April 30 Talbot, Birkbeck Bank chmrs, Holbora

WALKER, WILLIAM, Bexhill on Sea April 30 Lyell & Betenson, Raymond bldgs, Gray's inn

WARD, CHARLES, Staintondale, nr Scarborough, Farmer May 4 Turnbull & Son, Scarboroug

WARRINGTON, WILLIAM, Stratford rd, Kensington May 1 Braby & Macdonald, Arundel st, Strand

WEEKES, EDMUND, Crook Log, Bexley Heath, Market Gardener April 20 Baynes, Bexley Heath

WHITTELL, MARY, Leamington May 13 Field & Sons, Leamington

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, April 2.

BURRELL, GEORGE, Liverpool May 2 Newman & Olley, Liverpool

CASTELL, GEORGE, Broadbridge Heath, Horsham May 18 Carr & Co, Rood ln, Fenchurch st

CHAIN, ALEXANDER, Liverpool, LRCB, LRCB May 15 Pennington & Higson, Liverpool

COCKSHOOT, SAMUEL, Salford, Lancs April 30 Parkinson & Co, Manchester

COURAGE, CHARLES MITCHELL, Ascof May 6 Drury & Attlee, Biliter sq

DAVENPORT, ALICE MARY, Liford rd, Cambersell April 30 Walter James, Lanercost rd, Tulse Hill

ENTWISTE, FREDERICK DAVID, Deptford, Timber Merchant May 6 Merchant & Co, Broadway, Deptford

RICHARDSON, MARY, Berwick upon Tweed April 25 Sanderson & Weatherhead, Berwick upon Tweed

ROGERS, HENRY, Merton, Lancs, Commission Agent May 2 Slater & Co, Manchester

ROSE, ANN ELIZABETH, Ipswich April 30 Marshall, Ipswich

ROUTLEDGE, ELIZABETH, Moss Side, Manchester May 4 Swire & Higson, Manchester

SASSOON, CHARLES ISAAC, Manchester, General Merchant June 4 Lawson & Co, Manchester

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, April 5.

BAZELEY, GEORGE, Spratton, Northampton, Stud Groom April 29 Darnell & Price, Northampton

BEAVER, MARY, King st, Snow hill May 14 Pearce & Sons, West Smithfield

BENSON, MICHAEL, Hay hill, Berkley sq June 24 Taylor & Taylor, New Broad st

BOUCHER, ARTHUR COUCH, Chichester May 11 Foster & Wells, Aldershot

BROOME, JOSEPH, Llandudno May 15 Cooper & Sons, Manchester

BROWN, GEORGE, North Shields April 30 Arnott & Co, Newcastle on Tyne

DALTRY, MARGARET, Newcastle upon Tyne May 18 Gibson & Co, Newcastle upon Tyne

DICKINSON, HAROLD, Jesmond, Newcastle upon Tyne, Oil Merchant May 5 Ward, Newcastle upon Tyne

EDWARDS, FRANCES, Weldon Bridge, Longframlington, Northumberland May 5 Ward, Newcastle upon Tyne

EMERK, ANN, Bothwell, Northampton April 25 Barclay & Ballison, Bristol

EWENS, ELIZA, Park ridings, Horsey May 31 Davies, Moorgate st

FENWICK, RALPH, Heaton, Newcastle upon Tyne May 5 Ward, Newcastle upon Tyne

HAMILTON, FRANCIS ALEXANDER, Finchley May 31 Paines & Co, St Helen's pl

HANSBURY, ARCHIBALD, Eldon st, Solicitor May 6 Hanbury & Co, New Broad st

HOPKES, ELIZABETH, New Malden May 9 Woodroffe & Ashby, Gt Dover st, Southwark

HOWELL, MARY CAROLINE, Walton on Naze, Essex May 14 Crosley & Burn, Moorgate st bridge

HUGHES, BRIDGET, Liverpool, Fruit Dealer May 5 Rudd, Liverpool
 HULLY, JOHN PARKER, Bentham, Yorks May 10 Thompson & Co, Lancaster
 HUNTER, FANNY, Sydenham April 26 Fury & Fury, Canterbury
 McBURNEE, WILLIE, Wharncliffe, Kirklington, Cumberland, Boot Maker May 1 Cartner
 & Milburn, Brampton
 MATTHEWS, ROSE, Newcastle-on-Tyne May 5 Ward, Newcastle-on-Tyne
 OAKLEY, ELIZABETH HUGGINS, Milton Keynes, Bucks May 11 Forbes & Son, MARK IN
 PRASIER, DINAH, Woodsome rd, Highgate rd, May 11 Goody & Sons, Colchester
 QUIGLEY, SARAH WINSTANLEY, Tunbridge Wells April 23 Fox & Co, Victoria st
 QUIGLEY, HENRY NATHANIEL, Plymouth May 4 Shelly & Johns, Plymouth

BREED, JOHN, Tenterden, Dealer April 19 Marc & Sons, Tenterden
 RICHARDSON, WILLIAM, Bedworth, Warwick, Milk Vendor May 1 Neo & Gordon Roberts,
 Holbeck
 SIDDALL, FREDERICK, Salford May 1 Almond & Sons, Manchester
 STEWARTSON, JAMES, Bootle, Lancs May 8 Smith & Son, Liverpool
 TAYLOR, HARRIET, Croydon May 8 Rowland & Hutchinson, Croydon
 TUKEE, REUBEN, Cardiff, Gardner May 1 Morgan & Co, Cardiff
 WHALEY, WILLIAM, Heywood, Lancs, Licensed Victualler May 1 Banks & Co,
 Heywood
 YEO, REV. CHARLES OLDHAM, Kexby, Yorks May 15 Leeman & Co, York

Bankruptcy Notices.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, March 29.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

ADAMS, WALTER, Worley, Leeds, Wheelwright Leeds Pet March 26 Ord March 26
 ARMITAGE, HARRY DAVID, and JAMES POOGON ARMITAGE, Mirfield, Yorks, Woollen Manufacturers Dewsbury Pet March 26 Ord March 26
 BELL, JAMES FREDERICK CARTHERS, John st, Bedford row, Architect High Court Pet March 7 Ord March 26
 BENNETT, WILLIAM, Bristol, Builder Bristol Pet March 27 Ord March 27
 BOVET, CHARLES LOUIS, Tanso rd, Hampstead High Court Pet Jan 31 Ord March 26
 BROWN, ETHEL GAACE, New Brighton, Chester, Jeweller Liverpool Pet Feb 22 Ord March 27
 BROOMEHEAD, PHILIP, Sheffield, Fried Fish Dealer Sheffield Pet March 27 Ord March 27
 BUTLER, JESSE, Kingmill, Castlemartin, Pembrokeshire, Farmer Pembrokeshire Pet March 25 Ord March 25
 CROSSLEY, JOHN HERBERT, Sheffield, Hawker Sheffield Pet March 25 Ord March 25
 DAVIES, BENJAMIN THOMAS, Ammanford, Carmarthen, Licensed Victualler Carmarthen Pet March 27 Ord March 27
 DAVISON, WILLIAM, South Gosforth Station, Northumberland, Stone Merchant Newcastle on Tyne Pet March 8 Ord March 27
 DAY, HENRY, Cambridge, Miller Cambridge Pet March 14 Ord March 27
 DICKINSON, ALFRED WILLIAM, and JOHN KIRKHAM, Jun., Bolton, Architects Preston Pet March 14 Ord March 27
 DRIVER, EDWARD, Cottingley, Bingley, Yorks, Pattern Maker Bradford Pet March 23 Ord March 25
 EDWARDS, WILLIAM, Swansea, Fruiterer Swansea Pet Pet March 27 Ord March 27
 EDWARDS, WILLIAM TEMPLE, Ashford, Kent, Carriage Builder Canterbury Pet March 14 Ord March 26
 FEAK, WILLIAM, Lozells, Birmingham, Electro Gilder Birmingham Pet March 27 Ord March 27
 FOX, ELIZA, Weston super Mare, Boarding House Keeper Bridgwater Pet March 26 Ord March 26
 FUNESS, FREDERICK GEORGE, Lamb's Conduit st, Military Boot Maker High Court Pet March 25 Ord March 25
 GREENING, WILLIAM BAKER, Stanton, Glos, Farmer Cheltenham Pet March 27 Ord March 27
 GUTSELL, HARRY ALBERT, King's Somborne, Southampton, Grocer Southampton Pet March 25 Ord March 25
 HARRIS, ARTHUR, Gloucester, Tailor Gloucester Pet March 22 Ord March 23
 HEARD, GEORGE THOMAS, Torquay, Saddler Exeter Pet March 25 Ord March 25
 HENDERSON, J. P., West Hartlepool, Wine Merchant Sunderland Pet Feb 25 Ord March 26
 HILL, CATHERINE CAROLINE GOUGH, Rhyl, Flint Bangor Pet Feb 25 Ord March 26
 JACOBSON, JACOB, Leeds, Tailor's Presser Leeds Pet March 23 Ord March 23
 JONES, MARYTRICK, Dolydd, Gresford, Carnarvon, Stone Mason Bangor Pet March 27 Ord March 27
 KERSHAW, CLEMENT MAGUIRE, Newton, Montgomery, Dentist Newport Pet March 23 Ord March 23
 KNIGHT, ARTHUR, Hoe st, Walthamstow, Essex, Tailor High Court Pet March 12 Ord March 27
 LUXTON, JAMES, Clayhidon, Devon, Farmer Exeter Pet March 26 Ord March 26
 MANN, ANDREW, Croydon, Builder High Court Pet March 1 Ord March 27
 MARSH, JAMES, Norfolk sq, High Court Pet Jan 31 Ord March 27
 MARTIN, HENRY ERSKINE, Sandland st, Red Lion st, Licensed Victualler High Court Pet March 26 Ord March 26

MEREDITH, WILLIAM, Dowlaish, Glam, Confectioner Merthyr Tydfil Pet March 23 Ord March 23
 MIDDLETON, WILLIAM, and ERNEST WILLIAM MIDDLETON, West Hartlepool, Fruiterer Sunderland Pet March 25 Ord March 25
 MOWAT, WILLIAM, Manchester, Grey Cloth Merchant Manchester Pet March 25 Ord March 25
 MUFTI, WILLIAM JOSEPH, Harton, South Shields, Durham, Fruiterer Newcastle on Tyne Pet March 27 Ord March 27
 MUNRO, SAMUEL PRICE, Teignmouth, Devon, Army Tutor Exeter Pet March 26 Ord March 26
 PARKINSON, WALTER JAMES, Middlesbrough, Cabinet Maker Middlesbrough Pet March 26 Ord March 26
 PLACKETT, HENRY, Long Eaton, Derby, Lacemaker Derby Pet March 27 Ord March 27
 RICHARDS, JOHN, Dowlaish Top, Dowlaish, Glam, Grocer Merthyr Tydfil Pet March 23 Ord March 23
 SHARKEY, JESSE, Nottingham, Monumental Mason Derby Pet March 27 Ord March 27
 SCHNEIDER, FREDERICK, Offerton rd, Clapham Wandsworth Pet March 9 Ord March 26
 SHOBROOK, JAMES, South Shore, Blackpool, Bank Clerk Preston Pet March 14 Ord March 27
 SINGER, THOMAS, Commercial rd, Builder High Court Pet March 1 Ord March 25
 STACKMANN, CARL, Heathfield ter, Chiswick, Photographer Brentford Pet March 25 Ord March 25
 STOCK, FRANCIS ARNOLD, Swindon, Newspaper Agent Swindon Pet March 25 Ord March 25
 STUTTLE, ALFRED ROBERT, Gresham st, Tailor High Court Pet March 25 Ord March 25
 SWIFT, CHARLES, Thorpe, Heesley, nr Rotherham, Yorks, Butcher Sheffield Pet March 27 Ord March 27
 UNDERWOOD, HORACE JOSHUA, New Oxford st, Fine Art Dealer High Court Pet March 25 Ord March 25
 WAIN, HENRY, Stanmore, Portsmouth, Beer Retailer Portsmouth Pet Feb 5 Ord March 25
 WALLINGTON, PRICE, Tufnell Park rd, Holloway, Baker High Court Pet March 25 Ord March 25
 WILLIAMS, WILLIAM, Blaenavon, Glam, Collier Pontypool Pet March 26 Ord March 26
 WOOD, ELIZABETH, Laisterdyke, Bradford, Herbalist Bradford Pet March 27 Ord March 27
 WOOD, JOHN, Flockton Hall, nr Wakefield, Farm Bailiff Wakefield Pet March 26 Ord March 26
 WORFOLD, W. Eastbourne, Builder Eastbourne Pet March 8 Ord March 26

RECEIVING ORDER RESCINDED.

MARSHAM, MOORE HAVELOCK, HMS Cumberland, Devonport, Captain RMLI Plymouth Rec Ord Dec 14, 1906 Rec March 20, 1907

FIRST MEETINGS.

ATKINS, JOHN WILLIAM, Newport, Mon, House Agent April 12 at 12 Off Rec, 144, Commercial st, Newport, Mon
 BAXTER, HERBERT, Mansfield, Notts, Builder April 9 at 11 Off Rec, 4, Castle pl, Park st, Nottingham
 CHESMAN, SAMUEL, Mytongate, Kingston upon Hull, Licensed Victualler April 10 at 11 Off Rec, Trinity House in, Hull
 COPEMAN, GEORGE WILLIAM BAZETT, Maidstone April 10 at 10.30 9, King st, Maidstone
 CORDEY, ERNEST HORACE, Wallingford, nr Reading, Grocer April 11 at 11.30 Queen's Hotel, Reading
 CRESWICK, JOSEPH WILLIAM, Sheffield, File Manager April 11 at 12 Off Rec, Fivepenny in, Sheffield
 DAVIES, JENKIN, Tredegar, Aberystwyth, Coal Merchant April 12 at 2.30 Townhall, Aberystwyth
 DOBBING, ALLAN JONES, Sunderland, Hairdresser April 11 at 8 Off Rec, 8, Manor pl, Sunderland
 FARROW, CHRISTOPHER, Nottingham, Mill Dealer April 9 at 12 Off Rec, 35, Victoria st, Liverpool
 FOX, HENRY FRANK, Moreton, Witte, Dairymen April 8 at 11 Off Rec, 38, Regent circus, Swindon

FURNESS, FREDERICK GEORGE, Lamb's Conduit st, Military Boot Maker April 12 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st Golds, RICHARD, Wokingham, Hairdresser April 11 at 12.30 Queen's Hotel, Reading GREENWALL, ARTHUR PROCTER, Morecambe, Boot Maker April 8 at 11 Off Rec, 14, Chapel st, Preston GUTSELL, HARRY ALBERT, King's Somborne, Southampton, Grocer April 8 at 11.30 Off Rec, Midland Bank Chambers, High st, Southampton HAGUE, EDWIN, Wentworth, nr Rotherham, Yorks, Farmer April 11 at 12.30 Off Rec, Figtree in, Sheffield HARRIS, ARTHUR, Gloucester, Tailor April 11 at 12 Off Rec, Station rd, Gloucester HEARD, GEORGE THOMAS, Torquay, Saddler April 11 at 10.30 Off Rec, 9, Bedford circus, Exeter HILL, HARRY, Hutton le Hole, nr Kirkbymoorside, Yorks, Grocer April 15 at 11.30 Court house, Northallerton JACOBSON, JACOB, Leeds, Tailor's Presser April 10 at 11 Off Rec, 22, Park row, Leeds KERSHAW, CLEMENT MAGUIRE, Newtown, Montgomery, Dentist April 10 at 10.30 1, High st, Newtown LAYCOCK, WILLIAM, Ballybridge April 6 at 11 Off Rec, Byrom st, Manchester LUXON, HENRY ALFRED, Chard, Somerset, Cabinet Maker April 13 at 12 10, Hammett, Taunton MANSFIELD, THOMAS CORNELIUS, Church Greeley, Derby, Plumber April 6 at 11 Off Rec, 47, Full st, Derby MARTIN, HENRY ERSKINE, Sandland st, Red Lion st, Licensed Victualler April 13 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st MASON, JOSEPH, Newmarket, Clerk April 10 at 10.45 The White Hart Hotel, Newmarket MAXWELL, WILLIAM, 33 Holme, Lancs, Engineer April 15 at 10.30 Off Rec, 35, Victoria st, Liverpool MILES, EDWARD, Neath, Glam, Butcher April 9 at 12.30 Townhall, Neath NICHOLS, ALBERT JOSHUA, Elmdale rd, Southgate, Builder April 15 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st PEAKER, ERNEST DECRET, Kingston upon Hull, Fancy Goods Dealer April 10 at 11.30 Trinity House in, Hull POLLARD, HENRY, Chester, Boarding house Proprietor April 10 at 12 Crypt Chambers, Eastgate row, Chester RIBBERT, ROBERT HARRY, Chilham, Kent, Butcher April 11 at 8.15 Off Rec, 65a, Castle st, Canterbury SINGER, THOMAS, Commercial rd, Builder April 12 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st SMITH, JOHN WILLIAM, Stockton on Tees, Crane Driver April 10 at 3 Off Rec, 8, Albert rd, Middlesbrough STOCK, FRANCIS ARNOLD, Swindon, Newspaper Agent April 8 at 11.30 Off Rec, 26, Regent circus, Swindon STUTTLE, ALFRED ROBERT, Gresham st, Tailor April 10 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st TYSON, JAMES, Gosforth, Newcastle, Builder April 8 at 11 Court House, Whitehaven UNDERWOOD, HORACE JOSHUA, New Oxford st, Fine Art Dealer April 8 at 1 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st WAKEFIELD, ARTHUR FARNICK, Newport, Fancy Goods Dealer April 12 at 12.30 Off Rec, 144, Commercial st, Newport, Mon WALLINGTON, PRICE, Tufnell Park rd, Holloway, Baker April 11 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st WILKINS, FREDERICK TOM, Knighton, Radnor, Carriage Builder April 11 at 1 Cornhill, Llanmister WILLIAMS, JOHN, Samon, Llandebie, Carmarthen, Clothier April 6 at 12 Off Rec, 4, Queen st, Carmarthen WINCHESTER, GEORGE CHARLES, Barnet, Fishmonger April 10 at 12 14, Bedford row

ADJUDICATIONS.

ADAMS, WALTER, Worley, Leeds, Wheelwright Lee's Pet March 26 Ord March 26
 BENNETT, WILLIAM, Bristol, Builder Bristol Pet March 27 Ord March 27
 BROOMEHEAD, PHILIP, Sheffield, Fried Fish Dealer Sheffield Pet March 23 Ord March 23

THE LICENSES INSURANCE CORPORATION AND GUARANTEE FUND, LIMITED,

24, MOORGATE STREET, LONDON, E.C.
 ESTABLISHED IN 1891.

EXCLUSIVE BUSINESS—LICENSED PROPERTY.

SPECIALISTS IN ALL LICENSING MATTERS.

X 530 Appeals to Quarter Sessions have been conducted under the direction and supervision of the Corporation. X

Suitable Insurance Clauses for Inserting in Leases or Mortgages of Licensed Property, Settled by Counsel, will be sent on application.

BROWNING, H. S., Prince of Wales man, Battersea Park, Army Captain Wandsworth Pet Feb 21 Ord March 25

BURKE, ALFRED DAVID, Golden sq, Commercial Traveller High Court Pet Feb 28 Ord March 25

CROSBY, JOHN HERBERT, Sheffield, Hawker Sheffield Pet March 25 Ord March 23

DAVIES, BENJAMIN THOMAS, Ammanford, Carmarthen, Licensed Victualler Carmarthen Pet March 27 Ord March 27

DRIVER, EDWARD, Cottlingley, Bingley, Yorks, Pattern Maker Bradford Pet March 25 Ord March 27

DUNTON, GEORGE, and WILLIAM LAWRENCE, Bromley, Builders Croydon Pet Nov 28 Ord March 26

EDWARDS, WILLIAM, Swansea, Fruiterer Swansea Pet March 27 Ord March 27

ELY, MONTAGUE FREDERIC, Foster in High Court Pet Jan 11 Ord March 22

FLETCHER, CHARLES EDWARD, Lower James st, Golden sq, Silk Merchant High Court Pet March 5 Ord March 26

FOX, ELIZA, Weston super Mare, Lodging house Keeper Bridgwater Pet March 26 Ord March 26

FURNES, FREDERICK GEORGE, Lambs Conduit st, Military Bootmaker High Court Pet March 25 Ord March 25

GOLDBERG, MAX, Attercliffe, Sheffield, Draper Sheffield Pet March 2 Ord March 27

GREENING, WILLIAM BAKER, Stanton, Glos, Farmer Cheltenham Pet March 27 Ord March 27

GUTSELL, HARRY ALBERT, Kings Somerby, Southampton, Grocer Southampton Pet March 23 Ord March 25

HANFER, ALICE MAUD, Oulton, Warwick, Grocer Birmingham Pet March 22 Ord March 26

HARRIS, ARTHUR, Gloucester, Tailor Gloucester Pet March 22 Ord March 26

HEARD, GEORGE THOMAS, Torquay, Saddler Exeter Pet March 25 Ord March 25

HIRST, MARTIN, Mythe rd, Clapham Common Wandsworth Pet Jas 29 Ord March 25

HOWELL, GEORGE STANLEY, Salisbury House, Accountant High Court Pet Aug 2 Ord March 25

JACOBSON, JACOB, Leeds, Tailor's Presser Leeds Pet March 23 Ord March 23

JONES, MEYRICK, Dyllyd, Greslon, Carnarvon, Stone Mason Bangor Pet March 27 Ord March 27

KNIGHT, THOMAS, Ilfracombe, Hotel Proprietor Barnstaple Pet Feb 25 Ord March 27

LEECH, HARRY, Shaw, Lancs, Machinist Oldham Pet Feb 22 Ord March 27

LEVY, LEWIS HENRY, Borough Market, Southwark, Salesman High Court Pet Feb 19 Ord March 27

LUND, GEORGE, Sydenham, Agent High Court Pet Sept 21 Ord March 23

MADDOCKS, RICHARD HENRY, Birkenhead, Contractor Birkenhead Pet March 11 Ord March 26

MASON, JOSEPH, Newmarket, Clerk Cambridge Pet March 22 Ord March 25

MERRIDITH, WILLIAM, Dowlais, Glam, Confectioner Merthyr Tydfil Pet March 25 Ord March 25

MIDDLETON, WILLIAM, and ERNEST WILLIAM MIDDLETON, West Hartlepool, Fruiterers Sunderland Pet March 25 Ord March 25

PARKINSON, WALTER JAMES, Middlebrough Middlesbrough Pet March 26 Ord March 26

PATERSON, CHARLES JOHN, Gt St Helens, Bishopsgate st, Merchant High Court Pet Feb 12 Ord March 25

PLACKETT, HENRY, Long Eaton, Derby, Lacemaker Derby Pet March 27 Ord March 27

POPE, ALFRED JOHN, Bristol, Licensed Victualler Bristol Pet March 7 Ord March 25

REDWOOD, CHARLES JESSE, Bristol, Grocer Bristol Pet March 19 Ord March 26

RICHARDS, JOHN, Dowlais, Glam, Grocer Merthyr Tydfil Pet March 25 Ord March 25

SCARBY, JESSE, Nottingham, Monumental Mason Derby Pet March 27 Ord March 27

STACKEMAN, CARL, Heathfield ter, Chiswick, Photographer Brentford Pet March 25 Ord March 25

STOCK, FRANCIS, WOLLCOTT, Swindon, Newspaper Agent Swindon Pet March 25 Ord March 25

SWIFT, CHARLES, Thorpe Hosley, nr Rothosham, Yorks, Biscuit Sheffield Pet March 27 Ord March 27

TAYLOR, THOMAS ANDREW VYSE, High Wycombe, Brewer's Manager Aylesbury Pet Dec 29 Ord March 25

WALLOTTING, ERIC, Tunstall Park rd, Holloway, Baker High Court Pet March 25 Ord March 25

WILLIAMS, JOHN, Llandeilo, Carmarthen, Clothier Carmarthen Pet Feb 22 Ord March 26

WILLIAMS, WILLIAM, Blaenyclodach, Glam, Collier Pontypridd Pet March 26 Ord March 25

WOOD, ELIZABETH, Listerdyke, Bradford, Herbalist Bradford Pet March 27 Ord March 27

WOOD, JOHN, Flockton Hall, nr Wakefield, Yorks, Farm Bailiff Wakefield Pet March 26 Ord March 26

WOOD, ROWLAND, Blackpool, Restaurant Proprietor Huddersfield Pet Feb 28 Ord March 25

Amended notice substituted for that published in the London Gazette of Nov 20:

COHEN, HARRY, Grosvenor rd, Canonbury, Dealer in Furs High Court Pet Oct 16 Ord Nov 16

London Gazette, TUESDAY, April 2.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

BAKER, WILLIAM DUKE, Chute Vicarage, Wilts Swindon Pet March 25 Ord March 28

BROWN, ALICE JANE, Kingston upon Hull, Saw Mill Proprietor Kingston upon Hull Pet March 19 Ord March 28

COOPER, WALTER FRANKLIN, Rearaby, Leicester, Traveller Leicester Pet March 11 Ord March 26

EMMS, GEORGE, Northampton, Milliner Northampton Pet March 28 Ord March 28

KNOWLES, GEORGE FREDERIC, Gt Yarmouth, House Agent Gt Yarmouth Pet March 25 Ord March 28

LEVI, LOUIS, Leeds, Plumber Leeds Pet March 28 Ord March 28

LOVETT, ALFRED EDWARD, Derby, Restaurant Keeper Derby Pet March 26 Ord March 28

MAPF, WILLIAM ROSE, Closbury Mortimer, Salop, Grocer Kidderminster Pet March 27 Ord March 27

MORDANT, WILLIAM GEORGE, Aldershot, Traveller Guildford Pet March 27 Ord March 27

OVERTON, JAMES HADDON, Woodstock, Oxford, Schoolmaster Oxford Pet March 28 Ord March 28

PULLEY, HARRY EDWARD, Chatteris, I of Ely, Cambridge, Railway Station Master Peterborough Pet March 28 Ord March 28

RUFFELL, JOHN THOMAS, Hockley, Essex, Builder Chelmsford Pet March 27 Ord March 27

SPENCER, ALFRED, Maidstone, Wine Merchant Maidstone Pet March 14 Ord March 27

STRINGER, JOSEPH, Hedon, Yorks, Coal Merchant Kingston upon Hull Pet March 23 Ord March 28

TAYLOR, ALBERT, Leicester, Coal Merchant Leicester Pet March 28 Ord March 28

FIRST MEETINGS.

ARMITAGE, HARRY DAVID, and JAMES POSSON ARMITAGE, Mirfield, Woollen Manufacturers April 12 at 11.30 Off Rec, Bank chmrs, Corporation st, Dewsbury

BAILEY, ROBERT HANS, Great Worcester, Wood Turner April 11 at 11.30 191, Corporation st, Birmingham

BUSHELL, HENRY, Aneler, Boot Dealer April 11 at 11.30 132, York rd, Westminster Bridge

CARTER, WILLIAM ALFRED, Derby, Glass Dealer April 12 at 3 Off Rec, 47, Full st, Derby

CAYLEY, SIR GEORGE EVERARD ARTHUR, Woodbridge, Suffolk April 11 at 12 Royal Station Hotel, York

DAVISON, WILLIAM, South Gosforth Station, Northumberland, Stone Merchant Newcastle on Tyne April 10 at 11 Off Rec, 30, Mosley st, Newcastle on Tyne

EVANS, WILLIAM, Birmingham, Accountant April 12 at 11.30 191, Corporation st, Birmingham

HAZELWOOD, JOSEPH, Batley, Millhand April 12 at 10.30 Off Rec, Bank chmrs, Corporation st, Dewsbury

JONES, WILLIAM, Degany, Carnarvon, Joiner April 12 at 12 Crypt chmbrs, Eastgate row, Chester

LIVSEY, JOHN WILLIAM, Heaton Moor, Lancs April 10 at 11 Off Rec, Castle chmbrs, 6, Vernon st, Stockport

MACKIE, ANGUS M., Rodenburgh rd, Clapham April 12 at 12.30 182, York rd, Westminster Bridge

MUIITT, WILLIAM JOSEPH, Harton, South Shields, Fruiterer April 10 at 11.30 Off Rec, 30, Mosley st, Newcastle on Tyne

SHAKSPEARE, ARTHUR, Small Heath, Birmingham, Insurance Agent April 15 at 11.30 191, Corporation st, Birmingham

SHAW, ALBERT EDWARD, Heckmondwike, Yorks, Boot Dealer April 12 at 3 Off Rec, Bank chmbrs, Corporation st, Dewsbury

SPENCER, ALFRED, Maidstone, Wine Merchant April 10 at 10.45 9, King st, Maidstone

STRONG, ALBERT EDWARD, Workington, Cumberland, Grocer April 12 at 2.45 Court house, Cockermouth

TITTENHORN, ARTHUR, Derby, Wood Turner April 12 at 11 Off Rec, 47, Full st, Derby

WAINE, HENRY, Stamford, Portsmouth, Beer Retailer April 11 at 3 Off Rec, Cambridge June, High st, Portsmouth

WHITFIELD, JOHN, Bishop Auckland, Durham, Hardware Dealer April 12 at 3 Off Rec, 3, Manor pl, Sunderland

WILLIAMS, WILLIAM, Blaenyclodach, Glam, Collier April 11 at 11.30 Post Office chmbrs, Pontypridd

WOOD, ELIZABETH, New Bridge, Leiston, Bradford, Herbalist April 11 at 3 Off Rec, 29, Manor row, Bradford

WOOD, JOHN, Flockton Hall, nr Wakefield, Farm Bailiff April 11 at 10.30 Off Rec, 6, Bond ter, Wakefield

ADJUDICATIONS.

BAKER, WILLIAM DUKE, Chute Vicarage, Wilts Swindon Pet March 28 Ord March 28

GRIMES, WALTER, Bolton, Builder Bolton Pet Feb 5 Ord March 28

KNOWLES, GEORGE FREDERIC, Gt Yarmouth, House Agent Gt Yarmouth Pet March 28 Ord March 28

LEVI, LOUIS, Leeds, Plumber Leeds Pet March 28 Ord March 28

LOVETT, ALFRED EDWARD, Derby, Restaurant Keeper Derby Pet March 28 Ord March 28

MAPF, WILLIAM ROSE, Closbury Mortimer, Salop, Grocer Kidderminster Pet March 27 Ord March 27

PULLEY, HARRY EDWARD, Chatteris, I of Ely, Cambridge, Railway Station Master Peterborough Pet March 28 Ord March 28

RUFFELL, JOHN THOMAS, Hockley, Essex, Builder Chelmsford Pet March 27 Ord March 27

STRINGER, JOSEPH, Hedon, Yorks, Coal Merchant Kingston upon Hull Pet March 28 Ord March 28

TAYLOR, ALBERT, Leicester, Coal Merchant Leicester Pet March 28 Ord March 28

Amended notice substituted for that published in the London Gazette of March 15:

GEORGE, GEORGE ARTHUR, Swansea, Jeweller Swansea Pet March 12 Ord March 12

London Gazette, FRIDAY, April 5.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

BAKER, JOHN, Oxford st, Hairdresser High Court Pet April 3 Ord April 3

BALLS, WILLIAM, Hornford, Norfolk, General Shopkeeper Norwich Pet April 3 Ord April 3

BAYNES, GEORGE AYLMEY, Piccadilly High Court Pet Dec 8 Ord April 3

BERNACCHI, ANGELO GIULIO DIEGO, Crutched Friars, Company Promoted High Court Pet Jan 9 Ord March 28

BOOTH, GEORGE, Sheffield, Fried Fish Dealer Sheffield Pet April 3 Ord April 3

BRAMLEY, MARY VICTORIA ELIZABETH, and JOSEPH DANIEL MILLINS, Harrow rd, Monumental Masons High Court Pet Feb 11 Ord March 28

BROWN, ALICE JANE, Kingston upon Hull, Saw Mill Proprietor Kingston upon Hull Pet March 19 Ord April 3

BUFFLES, JESSE, Kingmill, Castlemartin, Pembroke, Fembroke Dock Pet March 25 Ord April 3

CLARKE, HARRY, Eckington, Worcester, Market Gardener Worcester Pet April 3 Ord April 3

COMELY, HENRY JOHN, Cardiff, Licensed Victualler Cardiff Pet April 3 Ord April 3

CRICKMAY, ERNEST WILLIAM, Thornton Heath rd, Croydon, Architect High Court Pet March 28 Ord March 28

DICKINSON, ALFRED WILLIAM and JOHN KIRKHAM, jun, Cleveleys, dr Fleetwood, Lancs, Architects Preston Pet March 14 Ord March 28

FEARN, WILLIAM, Lozells, Birmingham, Electro Gilder Birmingham Pet March 27 Ord March 28

FERGUSON, MARGARET, Liverpool, Engineer Liverpool Pet April 3 Ord April 3

FORREST, TOM, Dewsbury, Licensed Victualler Dewsbury Pet April 3 Ord April 3

FOX, FREDERICK GEORGE, Walton on the Naze, Essex, General Outfitter Colchester Pet April 3 Ord April 3

HARRISON, CHARLES, Bolton, Provision Dealer Bolton Pet April 3 Ord April 3

HARRISON, CHARLES, Bolton, Provision Dealer Bolton Pet April 3 Ord April 3

HARRISON, JOHN, Frith's Farm rd, Wilts, Farmer Bath Pet April 3 Ord April 3

MITCHINSON, THOMAS, Richmond rd, Bayswater, Furniture Dealer High Court Pet Feb 28 Ord April 3

OATRIDGE, FREDERICK, Upper Wyche, Malvern, Worcester, Carpenter Worcester Pet April 3 Ord April 3

OSBORN, ANNIE MARIA, Wotton under Edge, Glos, Licensed Victualler Gloucester Pet April 3 Ord April 3

ROSE, ERNEST HARVEY, and ARTHUR EDMUND CAUSE, Bristol, Fruit Merchants Bristol Pet April 3 Ord April 3

ROBINSON, EDWARD, Staincliffe, Batley, Yorks, Triple Dresser Dewsbury Pet April 3 Ord April 3

ROSE, GEORGE, Upton, Lincs, Labourer Lincoln Pet April 3 Ord April 3

SIDNEY, ELIZABETH MARY, Bridlington, Yorks, Hotel Keeper Scarborough Pet April 3 Ord April 3

TAYLOR, DAVID, Aston Manor, Warwick, Coal Merchant Birmingham Pet March 28 Ord March 28

THOMPSON, ARTHUR CASS, West Hartlepool, Jeweller Sunderland Pet March 15 Ord April 3

TURNER, JOSEPH EVERETT, Walmer, Kent, Builder Canterbury Pet April 3 Ord April 3

WALLIS, WILLIAM THOMAS, Easton, Portland, Dorset, Bookseller Dorchester Pet April 3 Ord April 3

WILKINSON, JOHN FREDERICK, Blakelee, Kingsley, nr Frodsham, Chester, Farmer Warrington Pet March 28 Ord March 28

WILLIAMS, JOHN FREDERICK, Blakelee, Kingsley, nr Frodsham, Chester, Farmer Warrington Pet March 21 Ord April 3

FIRST MEETINGS.

ADAMS, WALTER, Worley, Leeds, Wheelwright April 17 at 11 Off Rec, 22, Park row, Leeds

BELL, JAMES FREDERICK CARRINGTONS, John st, Bedford row, Architect April 15 at 1 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

BOVET, CHARLES LOUIS, Tanza rd, Hampstead April 16 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

BUTLER, JESSE, Kingsmill, Castlemartin, Pembroke, Farmer April 13 at 11.30 Off Rec, 4, Queen st, Carmarthen

CLARKE, HARRY, Eckington, Worcester, Market Gardener April 17 at 11.30 11, Copenhagen st, Worcester

CRICKMAY, ERNEST WILLIAM, Cavendish gdns, Clapton, Architect April 16 at 1 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

DAVIES, BENJAMIN THOMAS, Ammanford, Carmarthen, Licensed Victualler April 13 at 12 Off Rec, 4, Queen st, Carmarthen

EMMS, GEORGE, Northampton, Milliner April 16 at 11 Off Rec, Bridge st, Northampton

GARTH, JAMES, Wingate, Durham, Baker April 17 at 3 Off Rec, 3, Manor pl, Sunderland

KNIGHT, ARTHUR, Walthamstow, Essex, Tailor April 18 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

MADDOCKS, RICHARD HENRY, Birkenhead, Chester, Contractor April 15 at 2.30 Off Rec, 35, Victoria st, Liverpool

MANN, ANDREW, Croydon, Builder April 16 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

MARSH, JAMES, NORFOLK sq April 16 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

MEREDITH, WILLIAM, Dowlais, Glam, Confectioner April 16 at 11.30 Off Rec, County Court, Town Hall, Merthyr Tydfil

MIDDLETON, WILLIAM, and ERNEST WILLIAM MIDDLETON, West Hartlepool, Fruiterers April 17 at 3.30 Off Rec, 3, Manor pl, Sunderland

MOWAT, WILLIAM, Manchester, Grey Cloth Merchant April 15 at 3 Off Rec, Byrom st, Manchester

PARKER, CHARLES HENRY, and RALPH ARTHUR UNTHORN, Lowestoft, Dairymen April 13 at 12.30 Off Rec, 8, King st, Norwich

RICHARDS, JOHN, Dowlais, Glam, Grocer April 16 at 10.30 Off Rec, County Court, Town Hall, Merthyr Tydfil

SEARCY, JESSE, Nottingham, Monumental Mason April 13 at 11 Off Rec, 47, Full st, Derby

SMITHSON, CHARLES, Guinness, Linns, Labourer April 13 at 11 Off Rec, St Mary's chmbrs, Gt Grimsby

STRINGER, JOSEPH, Hedon, Yorks, Coal Merchant April 13 at 11 Off Rec, Trinity House in, Hull

ADJUDICATIONS.

BAKER, JOHN, Oxford st, Hairdresser High Court Pet April 3 Ord April 3

BALLS, WILLIAM, Hornford, Norfolk, General Shopkeeper Norwich Pet April 3 Ord April 3

BAYNES, GEORGE AYLMEY, Piccadilly High Court Pet Dec 8 Ord April 3

BERNACCHI, ANGELO GIULIO DIEGO, Crutched Friars, Company Promoted High Court Pet Jan 9 Ord March 28

BOOTH, GEORGE, Sheffield, Fried Fish Dealer Sheffield Pet April 3 Ord April 3

BRAMLEY, MARY VICTORIA ELIZABETH, and JOSEPH DANIEL MILLINS, Harrow rd, Monumental Masons High Court Pet Feb 11 Ord March 28

BROWN, ALICE JANE, Kingston upon Hull Pet March 19 Ord April 3

BUTLER, JESSE, Kingmill, Castlemartin, Pembroke, Fembroke Dock Pet March 25 Ord April 3

CLARKE, HARRY, Eckington, Worcester, Market Gardener Worcester Pet April 3 Ord April 3

COMELY, HENRY JOHN, Cardiff, Licensed Victualler Cardiff Pet April 3 Ord April 3

CRICKMAY, ERNEST WILLIAM, Thornton Heath rd, Croydon, Architect High Court Pet March 28 Ord March 28

DICKINSON, ALFRED WILLIAM and JOHN KIRKHAM, jun, Cleveleys, dr Fleetwood, Lancs, Architects Preston Pet March 14 Ord March 28

FEARN, WILLIAM, Lozells, Birmingham, Electro Gilder Birmingham Pet March 27 Ord March 28

FERGUSON, MARGARET, Liverpool, Engineer Liverpool Pet April 3 Ord April 3

FORREST, TOM, Dewsbury, Licensed Victualler Dewsbury Pet April 3 Ord April 3

FOX, FREDERICK GEORGE, Walton on the Naze, Essex, General Outfitter Colchester Pet April 3 Ord April 3

HARRISON, CHARLES, Bolton, Provision Dealer Bolton Pet April 3 Ord April 3

MESSRS. H. E. FOSTER & CRANFIELD'S LIST. 6, POULTRY, E.C.

PERIODICAL PROPERTY AUCTIONS.

MESSRS. H. E. FOSTER & CRANFIELD
beg to announce that their PROPERTY AUCTIONS
are held at the Mart, Tokenhouse-yard, E.C., on the first and
third Wednesdays in every month throughout the year.

The dates for 1907 are as follows:—

Wednesday, May 1	Wednesday, Sept. 4
Wednesday, May 15	Wednesday, Oct. 2
Wednesday, June 5	Wednesday, Oct. 16
Wednesday, June 19	Wednesday, Nov. 6
Wednesday, July 3	Wednesday, Dec. 4
Wednesday, July 17	Wednesday, Dec. 18
Wednesday, August 7	
Wednesday, August 21	

Vendors, solicitors, and trustees having properties for sale are respectfully invited to communicate with the Auctioneers, at their Office, 6, Poultry, London, E.C. Telegrams: "Invariably, London." Tel. Nos. 999 Bank, and 8839 Central.

Re Wm. Prince, deceased.—By Order of Trustees, CHELSEA.—The valuable FREEHOLD GROUND-RENTS of £180 per annum and peppercorn ground-rents, secured upon Nos. 74 to 88 (even), KING'S ROAD, Nos. 2 to 7, ANDERSON STREET, Nos. 12 to 17, LINCOLN STREET, and Nos. 9 to 17, COULSON STREET, with reversion in 1942 to rack-rents, now estimated at £2,683 per annum.

CHELSEA.—In the main King's-road.—A very valuable FREEHOLD GROUND-RENT of £210 per annum (with early reversion), amply secured upon extensive premises, including Nos. 120 to 126 (even), KING'S ROAD, spacious manufacturing premises in the rear, Wesleyan Chapel, motor garage, and five houses, Nos. 1, 3, 5, 7, and 9, College-place, the entire site covering over an acre; reversion in 16 years to rack-rents estimated at £3,000 per annum.

By Order of the Executors of W. H. R. Weeding, deceased, KENTISH TOWN.—Valuable FREEHOLD GROUND-RENTS, amounting to £329 15s. per annum, secured upon 189 SHOPS and PRIVATE HOUSES, situate in MALDEN ROAD, MARSDEN STREET, QUEEN'S CRESCENT, WEEDINGTON ROAD, BASSETT STREET, PRINCE OF WALES ROAD, RHYL STREET, ST. LEONARD'S SQUARE, and TOVEY PLACE, with reversion in 1940 to rack-rents, now estimated at £7,199 per annum.

Re Wm. Prince, deceased, SYDENHAM.—The FREEHOLD RESIDENCE, known as No. 41, VENNER ROAD, containing five bedrooms, bath-room, three reception-rooms, and offices; good gardens front and rear; with Possession.

OXFORDSHIRE.—An attractive FREEHOLD AGRICULTURAL PROPERTY, known as the NETHER WORTON ESTATE, about eight miles from Banbury, divided into two convenient farms, with good houses and buildings, and together embracing an area of 380a. 2r. 34p.;

producing a rental of £410 per annum; also the Advowson, together with the Manor, or reputed Manor, of Nether Worton.

MESSRS. H. E. FOSTER & CRANFIELD
will SELL by AUCTION, at the MART, E.C., on WEDNESDAY, MAY 1, at TWO, in Lots, the above valuable FREEHOLDS.

Particulars of the Auctioneers, 6, Poultry, E.C.

PERIODICAL SALES.

ESTABLISHED 1843.

MESSRS. H. E. FOSTER & CRANFIELD
(successors to Marsh, Milner, & Co.) conduct
PERIODICAL SALES of
REVERSIONS (Absolute and Contingent),
LIFE INTERESTS and ANNUITIES,
LIVE POLICIES,
Shares and Debentures,
Mortgage Debts and Bonds, and
Kindred Interests.

on the FIRST and THIRD THURSDAYS in each month throughout the year, at the MART, Tokenhouse-yard, E.C.

The dates fixed for 1907 are as follows:—

Thursday, April 18	Thursday, Sept. 5
Thursday, May 2	Thursday, Sept. 19
Thursday, May 16	Thursday, Oct. 3
Thursday, June 6	Thursday, Oct. 17
Thursday, June 20	Thursday, Nov. 7
Thursday, July 4	Thursday, Nov. 21
Thursday, July 18	Thursday, Dec. 5
Thursday, August 1	Thursday, Dec. 19

Offices, 6, Poultry, London, E.C. Telegrams: "Invariably, London." Tel. Nos. 999 Bank, and 8839 Central.

THURSDAY NEXT.—Periodical Sale No. 833.—Reversion. **MESSRS. H. E. FOSTER & CRANFIELD**
will SELL by AUCTION, at the MART, Tokenhouse-yard, E.C., on THURSDAY, APRIL 18, at TWO o'clock:—

ABSOLUTE REVERSION, receivable on death of lady 64, to One-eighth of Leaseholds at Fulham, producing £225 18s. 4d. per annum.

Particulars of Messrs. Karuth, Browne, & Co., Solicitors, 61, Carey-street, W.C., and 6, Union-court, E.C.; and of the Auctioneers.

THURSDAY NEXT.—Periodical Sale No. 833.—Reversion. **MESSRS. H. E. FOSTER & CRANFIELD**
will SELL by AUCTION, on THURSDAY, APRIL 18:—

ABSOLUTE REVERSION, receivable on decease of a lady aged 70, to One-fourth of a Trust Fund of the estimated value of £11,600.

Particulars of Messrs. Welman & Sons, Solicitors, Bank-chambers, 76a, Westbourne-grove, W.; and of the Auctioneers.

THURSDAY NEXT.—Periodical Sale No. 833.—Debentures. **MESSRS. H. E. FOSTER & CRANFIELD**
will SELL by AUCTION, on THURSDAY, APRIL 18, in Lots:

ASSOCIATED OMNIBUS CO. (Limited).—£1,500 Five per cent. Debentures.

Particulars of the Auctioneers, 6, Poultry, E.C.

THURSDAY NEXT.—Periodical Sale No. 833.—Debentures. **MESSRS. H. E. FOSTER & CRANFIELD**
will SELL by AUCTION, on THURSDAY, APRIL 18, in Lots:

NATIONAL PROVIDENT INSTITUTION.—Life 69; reduced premium, £5 17s. 4d.

Particulars of W. N. Harris, Esq., Solicitor, Matlock; of Messrs. Challinor & Shaw, Solicitors, Leek, Staffs; of Messrs. Bell, Brodrick, & Gray, Solicitors, 63, Queen Victoria-street; and of the Auctioneers.

THURSDAY NEXT.—Periodical Sale No. 833.—Debentures. **MESSRS. H. E. FOSTER & CRANFIELD**
will SELL by AUCTION, on THURSDAY, APRIL 18:—

SCOTTISH WIDOWS' FUND AND LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.—Life 62; premium, £451 2s. 7d.

SCOTTISH WIDOWS' FUND AND LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.—Life 71; premium, £29 1s. 8d.; bonuses, £809 6s. 2d.

£1,000, **£1,000,** **£800,** SCOTTISH WIDOWS' FUND AND LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY; life 71; premium, £29 1s. 8d.; bonuses, £809 6s. 2d.

NATIONAL PROVIDENT INSTITUTION.—Life 69; reduced premium, £5 17s. 4d.

Particulars of W. N. Harris, Esq., Solicitor, Matlock; of Messrs. Bell, Brodrick, & Gray, Solicitors, 63, Queen Victoria-street; and of the Auctioneers.

THURSDAY NEXT.—Periodical Sale No. 833.—Debentures. **MESSRS. H. E. FOSTER & CRANFIELD**
will SELL by AUCTION, on THURSDAY, APRIL 18:—

ASSOCIATED OMNIBUS CO. (Limited).—£1,500 Five per cent. Debentures.

Particulars of the Auctioneers, 6, Poultry, E.C.

LAW PARTNERSHIP.—Solicitor, age 27,

Honours at Final, and in suburban practice on own account 5½ years since. Desires to Purchase Partnership in City Firm; capital to £20,000, and will bring in own connection.—L. W., care of Solicitors' Law Stationery Society (Limited), 22, Chancery-lane, W.C.

DILAPIDATIONS.—Surveyor Prepares

Schedules and Plans or Undertakes Estate Management and Rent Collection on Salary or Commission; terms moderate; 17 years' London experience.—E. A. C., 90, Queen-square, W.C.

FREEHOLD GROUND-RENTS Wanted,

to fit sums of £500, £1,200, and £2,000; quarterly property preferred; half-year's commission required.—S. L. S., Son, & Carden, Auctioneers, 31, Hatton-garden, E.C.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, April 9.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

BATES, WALTER OWEN, Smethwick, Staffs, Journeyman Butcher West Bromwich Pet April 6 Ord April 6

ESSEX STREET, STRAND.—To be Let on Lease by Trustees, Commodious Building of well-let Offices, offering special facilities for very profitable outlay on additions.—Plans and particulars may be seen on application to HENRY T. CHALCRAFT, Architect and Surveyor, 43, Bishopsgate-street Within, E.C.

OFFICES in LARGE or SMALL SUITES.—39, 47, 56, and 58, Victoria-street, S.W.; 212a, Shaftesbury-avenue, W.C. (near Oxford-street).—Apply, HOUSEKEEPER, on the premises.

TO SOLICITORS.—£5 Paid for Recovery of supposed Mortgage for £700 on a Reversion to GASTANO P. GAU; if paid off, £1 for evidence thereof.—G., 32, Dynham-road, West Hampstead, N.W.

MORTGAGE INVESTMENTS.—Messrs. MAY & BOWDEN have decided to develop further this class of business, and will therefore be glad to see both Borrowers and Lenders; only good-class securities dealt with; no flats or weekly property.—Offices: 27, Maddox-street, W.

MONEY—FROM £500 to £5,000.—Would any responsible Gentleman, in Town or Country, be willing to pay a fair rate of interest for an IMMEDIATE ADVANCE OF CASH upon their own PROMISSORY NOTE, without Security, Publicity, or fees, and strictly private.

Call or write to the Actual Lenders,
J. WESTON & CO.,
PRIVATE BANKERS,
30 & 31, DUKE STREET, PICCADILLY,
LONDON, W.

ADVANCES, £400 to £8,000, in convenient sums, on good securities.—Apply, YOUNG, HOLBROOK, & SADLER, Valuers, Hove.

MADAME TUSSAUD'S EXHIBITION.—REALISTIC TABLEAU. The BURNING OF ROME. Mr. Beerbohm Tree in the character of Nero. Lifelike Portrait Model of the late Sir Wilfrid Lawson. Open 9 till 10.

Telephone: 602 Holborn.

EDE, SON AND RAVENSCROFT
FOUNDED IN THE REIGN OF WILLIAM & MARY, 1689.

ROBE MAKERS.  **COURT TAILORS.**
To H.M. THE KING & H.M. THE QUEEN.

SOLICITORS' GOWNS.
LEVEL Suits in CLOTH & VELVET.
Wigs for Registrars, Town Clerks, & Coroners.
CORPORATION & UNIVERSITY GOWNS.

93 & 94, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.
The Companies Acts, 1862 to 1900.

BY  AUTHORITY

Every requisite under the above Acts supplied on the shortest notice.
The BOOKS and FORMS kept in Stock for immediate use.
SHARE CERTIFICATES, DEBENTURES, &c., engraved and printed. OFFICIAL SEALS designed and executed.
Solicitors' Account Books.

RICHARD FLINT & CO.
Stationers, Printers, Engravers, Registration Agents, &c.,
49, FLEET STREET, LONDON, E.C. (corner of
Serjeants' Inn).

Journal and other Returns Standard and Full.

Tel. 227 Mayfair. *Ext. nearly of a Century.*

W. EVANS & CO.,
Under the same Proprietorship and Management since the House was founded. No connection with any other firm.

"TRUTH" says:—"Our latest discovery in Tailoring is Evans, 77, Great Portland-street, W., who can actually fit!"

We keep a choice and varied stock of materials for Town and Country wear at prices strictly moderate compatible with first-class workmanship.

Please note only address—
77, Great Portland St.,
LONDON, W.

Morning Coat from £2 5 0 | Lounge Suits from £2 3 0
Riding Breeches, 1 19 6 | Evening Dress Suit, 5 5

ST. ANDREW'S HOSPITAL FOR MENTAL DISEASES, NORTHAMPTON.

For the Upper and Middle Classes only.

PRESIDENT:
THE RIGHT HON. THE EARL SPENCER, K.G.

The Institution is pleasantly situated in a healthy locality, one mile from the Northampton Station of the London and North-Western and Midland Railways, and one-and-a-half hours only from London, and is surrounded by more than 100 acres of pleasure grounds.

The terms vary from 31s. 6d. to 24 4s. week, according to the requirements of the case. These terms may be reduced by the Committee of Management under special circumstances.

Patients paying higher rates can have Special Attendants, Horses and Carriages, and Private Rooms in the Hospital, or in Detached Villas in the Grounds of the Hospital; or at Moulton Park, a branch establishment, two miles from the Hospital.

There is also a Seaside House, Bryn-y-Neuadd Hall, Llanfairfechan, N. Wales, beautifully situated in a park of 180 acres, to which patients may be sent.

For further information apply to the Medical Superintendent.

Treatment of INEBRIETY.

DALRYMPLE HOUSE.

RICKMANSWORTH, HERTS.

For Gentlemen, under the Act and privately.
For Terms, &c., apply to
F. S. D. HOGG, M.R.C.S., &c.,
Medical Superintendent.
Telephone: P.O. 16, RICKMANSWORTH.

BUNTINGFORD RETREAT AND SANATORIUM.

FOR GENTLEMEN SUFFERING FROM INEBRIETY OR ABUSE OF DRUGS.

Privately or under the Inebriates Acts.
Two Resident Medical Officers.
Terms - - - - 1½ to 3½ Guineas.
½ mile from Station, G.E.R.

Apply to "Superintendent," Hillside, Buntingford.

INEBRIETY.

MELBOURNE HOUSE, LEICESTER.

PRIVATE HOME FOR LADIES.

Medical Attendant: ROBERT SEVESTRE, M.A., M.D. (Camb.). Principal: H. M. RILEY, Assoc. Soc. Study of Inebriety. Thirty years' Experience. Excellent Legal and Medical References. For terms and particulars apply Miss RILEY, or the Principal.

TELEGRAPHIC ADDRESS: "MEDICAL, LEICESTER."

MASKELYNE and DEVANT'S MYSTERIES, St. George's Hall, Daily at 3 and 8. Great success of THE MAGICIAN'S HEART, by E. Neabit (evenings only). £1,000 GHOST. MENTAL MAGNETISM. MR. J. N. MASKELYNE and MR. DEVANT at both performances. Seats 1s. to 5s.; children half-price. Phone, 1545 Mayfair.

BRAND'S

MEAT JUICE FOR INVALIDS.

Prepared from the Finest Meat only.

In Flasks, price 2/6.

SOLD EVERYWHERE.

BRAND & CO., Limited, MAYFAIR, W.

Grateful—Comforting.

EPPS'S

A welcome delicacy for

COCOA

Breakfast and Supper.

SALE DAYS FOR THE YEAR 1907.

MESSRS.
FAREBROTHER, ELLIS, EGERTON,
BREACH, GALSWORTHY, & CO.
beg to announce that the undermentioned dates have been fixed for their AUCTIONS of FREEHOLD, Copyhold, and Leasehold ESTATES, Reversions, Shares, Life Interests, &c., at the AUCTION MART, Tokenhouse-yard, E.C.

Other appointments for intermediate Sales can also be arranged.

Thursday, April 23
Thursday, May 2
Tuesday, May 14
Tuesday, May 28
Thursday, June 6
Thursday, June 13
Tuesday, June 18
Thursday, June 27
Tuesday, July 2
Thursday, July 4
Thursday, July 11

Thursday, July 18
Tuesday, July 23
Thursday, August 1
Thursday, September 26
Thursday, October 10
Thursday, October 24
Thursday, November 7
Thursday, November 21
Thursday, December 5
Thursday, December 12

A List of forthcoming Sales by Auction is published in the advertisement column of "The Times" every Saturday.

Messrs. Farebrother, Ellis, & Co. also issue on the 1st of every Month a SCHEDULE OF PROPERTIES TO BE LET OR SOLD, comprising landed and residential estates, farms, freehold and leasehold houses, town and country building land, City offices and warehouses, ground-rents, and investments generally, which will be forwarded free of charge. A carefully-revised register of applicants' wants is kept, and details of requirements are especially invited from those seeking properties, &c., to whom particulars of suitable places are sent from time to time. Applications should be made to their Offices, No. 29, Fleet-street, Temple-bar, E.C.

MESSRS. H. GEOGAN & CO., 101, Park street, Grosvenor-square, beg to call the attention of intending Purchasers to the many attractive West End Houses which they have for Sale. Particulars on application. Surveys and Valuations made for all purposes.

HOUSEHOLD

Removals

TO AND FROM ALL PARTS

AT

Moderate Rates.

ESTIMATES FREE.

Careful Storage of Furniture, Pictures, &c.,

in specially built Furniture Depository and Strong Rooms at

240 to 256, CITY RD., LONDON, E.C.
(Ten Minutes from the Bank of England).

PARIS: 13, Rue Vivienne.
Special Facilities for Paris Removals.

Thos. Wallis & Co., Ltd.

of HOLBORN CIRCUS.

A useful handbook on Removals and Warehousing sent free on application.

F.M.

ALEXANDER & SHEPHEARD, LIMITED.

PRINTERS,
LAW and PARLIAMENTARY.

PARLIAMENTARY BILLS, MINUTES OF EVIDENCE, BOOKS OF REFERENCE, STATEMENTS OF CLAIM, ANSWERS, &c., &c.

BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, MAGAZINES,
NEWSPAPERS,

And all General and Commercial Work.

Every description of Printing.

Printers of THE SOLICITORS' JOURNAL AND WEEKLY REPORTER.

NORWICH STREET, FETTER LANE, LONDON, E.C.

ON,
been
rests,
o be

er 36
10
24
er 7
or 21
er 5
er 12
inished
every

list of
D BE
tates,
country
rents,
free
ants'
cially
whom
time.
fleet-

ark-
ion of
t End
plic-

S

C.,
tory

E.C.
ne.
als.

&
Co.,
Ltd.
d
n.

IRD,
ED.

BOOKS OF
, &c.
NRS.

WORK.

ORTER.
E.C.